

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BEDELL AMENDMENT TO H.R.  
4444

**HON. BERKLEY BEDELL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing an amendment to H.R. 4444, the Small Reclamation Projects Act amendments, which the House will consider shortly. I include the text of the amendment, along with some other materials, at the end of this statement.

H.R. 4444 would double the appropriation ceiling for loans under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, from \$600 million to \$1.2 billion. The majority of funds loaned under the provisions of the Small Reclamation Projects Act are used to supply irrigation water. Under current law, interest is not paid on irrigation loans unless the recipient owns and receives U.S. Bureau of Reclamation [USBR] water on more than 960 acres. This and other generous criteria result in most recipients not being charged interest and in the Government providing huge subsidies for irrigation.

While this is a major issue worthy of future comprehensive study, I am today proposing a very modest amendment focused on a narrow issue—double subsidies. The problem is that, while the USBR is subsidizing interest-free irrigation loans for farmers to grow more crops, the Department of Agriculture is paying farmers not to grow these same crops. This hurts not only the taxpayers of every region of the country, but it hurts the many farmers who are at a disadvantage because they do not receive subsidized water. In the end, this wasteful conflict between long-term irrigation policy and short-term agricultural policy hurts everyone by driving up the deficits.

My amendment would require that, in the future, USBR charge interest on that portion of the loan which is used to provide irrigation benefits for crops which the USDA is paying farmers not to grow that year. Note that this amendment is fair because it would only apply to the additional \$600 million authorized in H.R. 4444. The amendment would not apply to funds already authorized, so no current recipients would be subject to unexpected interest costs. The required interest rate defined in section 5(c)(2) of the Small Reclamation Projects Act would be the same as is charged for

municipal water supply purposes and for irrigation of more than 960 acres.

This amendment is the product of careful consideration and past legislative compromise, and is the culmination of 2 years of study of this issue by the Department of Agriculture. It does not employ a meat ax approach and, after years of consideration of this proposal, I think it is time for action. I introduced a similar version of this amendment as a bill in the 97th Congress. This bill would have flatly prohibited the use of USBR water on surplus crops, not just denied the subsidy. The bill was offered in 1982 as an amendment to H.R. 5539, which was enacted into law as the Reclamation Reform Act (Public Law 97-239). During consideration of the bill in the House, my amendment was accepted by voice vote. Unfortunately, the Senate version of the bill contained a weaker version of that amendment which simply required a study of the problem. The conference report incorporated the Senate language, and section 222 of the Reclamation Reform Act read as follows:

EXCESS CROP RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 222. (a) Within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, with the cooperation of the Secretary of the Interior, shall transmit to the Congress a report on the production of surplus crops on acreage served by irrigation water. The report shall include—

(1) data delineating the production of surplus crops on lands served by irrigation water;

(2) the percentage of participation of farms served by irrigation water in set-aside programs, by acreage, crop, and State;

(3) the feasibility and appropriateness of requiring the participation in acreage set-aside programs of farms served by irrigation water and the costs of such a requirement; and

(4) any recommendations concerning how to coordinate national reclamation policy with agriculture policy to help alleviate recurring problems of surplus crops and low commodity prices.

(b) In addition, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of any Federal reclamation project authorized before the date of enactment of this Act, any restriction prohibiting the delivery of irrigation water for the production of excess basis agricultural commodities shall extend for a period no longer than ten years after the date of the initial authorization of such project.

We now have this study in hand. It confirms our fears that millions of dollars are being wasted and it suggests that the amendment I am introducing today—full-cost pricing for water used on crops in surplus—is one of the best ways to address this problem. We esti-

mate that the amendment could recover more than \$40 million in interest payments. According to the study:

Under (full cost pricing), USBR-served farmers would be placed on a comparable basis with other program crop producers in the Nation. National production efficiency would be expected to improve as production would move towards areas of comparative advantage. Program costs would be reduced due to lower production and higher prices; administrative costs would increase somewhat to assure compliance. The use of full-cost pricing for project water on farms in excess of 960 acres is already a feature of Public Law 97-293; rules and regulations are pending.

The USDA study noted that it would be unfair to make this proposal apply to current recipients. As I have stated, I have protected this group by writing the amendment to apply only to future loans.

In administering the program as modified by my amendment, the USBR would determine each year what portion of the loan amount was being used to pay for irrigation of surplus program crops, and compute the interest expenses for that year accordingly. Under current law, the portion of the loan attributable to providing municipal water supply or commercial power benefits (as opposed to irrigation benefits) must be repaid with interest. Because many reclamation projects are multipurpose and because the portion of the loan attributable to each purpose sometimes varies from year to year, USBR is already experienced in allocating project benefits on a yearly basis for purposes of repayment.

The USDA report analyzed the extra administrative costs required for a similar proposal which would require separation of irrigation water sources, mandatory acreage reduction program participation for recipients of USBR water, and found that total administrative costs would increase only slightly.

When, after 80 years, we determine that current irrigation policy is in conflict with current agricultural policy and is granting a double subsidy to produce commodities the Nation does not need, it is clearly time to make a change.

I believe that the amendment I am offering today is a small and reasonable step in the direction of reducing the deficit without denying any group benefits it already is receiving. I urge my colleagues to support this modest amendment and I include hereafter the text of the amendment and some

excerpts from the USDA report on this subject.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4444, AS REPORTED  
OFFERED BY MR. BEDELL

Page 2, after line 6, insert the following:

Before the first sentence, insert "(a)" and at the end of section 10 insert the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in the case of any loan authorized after the date of enactment of this subsection and funded with the additional monies authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), any contract negotiated by the Secretary under section 5 with respect to any such loan shall include provisions for the repayment by the organization of interest, as determined under section 5(c)(2), on that portion of the loan attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year for use with respect to crops for which there is in effect for that year a program to limit production of such crops, as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture."

PRODUCTION OF SURPLUS CROPS ON IRRIGATED  
LAND SERVED BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

[U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic  
Research Service, February 1984]

SUMMARY

The U.S. Department of Agriculture provides incentives to farmers to limit agricultural production. At the same time, the U.S. Department of the Interior's U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) subsidizes irrigation water for farmers in 17 Western States in order to increase production and bolster farmer income. The authors of this study examine the effects of each type of program on the other and develop options for resolving the apparent conflict of these two Federal programs. Some of the major findings are:

Reclamation and commodity program goals conflict:

Commodity programs emphasize short-term price and income levels and stability;

Reclamation programs emphasize, among other objectives, maintaining and expanding agricultural capacity over time;

A safe minimum level of capacity is warranted; no clear policy exists for determining the level.

One-fifth of the 50 million acres of irrigated land is served by USBR water:

USBR-served lands account for more than one-fourth of the value of production on irrigated cropland;

USBR-served farmers produce high-value crops; subsidized water provides a cost advantage to these farmers.

USBR farmers devote a smaller proportion of their land to program crops than do other farmers:

High-value crops—vegetables, fruits, and nuts—are important on USBR-served lands;

Proportion of USBR crops harvested that are cotton, rice, and barley is higher than for the United States; other USBR program crops are a lower proportion than for the United States.

Reclamation farmers participated in commodity programs at a lower rate than the rest of the United States in 1982:

USBR-served farmers participated at lower than U.S. rates for cotton, wheat, barley, sorghum, and oats;

Corn participation was higher than for the United States; rice participation was about the same.

Payment limitations and livestock demands for feed influence participation;

Budget examples suggest that typical USBR rice and cotton producers would have gained by participation.

Mandatory participation increases farmer's income overall; efficiency gains are mixed:

Required participation in 1982 would have increased U.S. farmers' income \$300 million, or about 2 percent;

Value of commodities at the farm gate would have increased \$260 million;

U.S. Treasury outlays would have decreased \$50 million;

Without existing water subsidies, cotton, rice, and wheat costs per unit of output would increase; per unit costs for the other program crops would decrease;

Mandatory participation resolved part of the inconsistency of program goals, the basic conflict remains; complex administrative rules would be required.

Other options were considered—do nothing, full-cost pricing, limits on water use, changes in justification and repayment:

Full-cost pricing or limits on use of water would be more effective than mandatory participation in resolving program inconsistencies;

Changes in justification procedures to reflect future free market conditions and full cost recovery would establish consistent policy on new projects;

Policy is needed to link long-term agricultural capacity and short-term farm income goals.

PROGRAM CROPS GROWN ON ACREAGES SERVED  
BY USER

Surplus crops are defined for this analysis as the crops for which an acreage reduction program was in effect in 1982. These program crops include wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, cotton, and rice. The 1982 commodity programs are considered representative of programs in recent years; 1982 is the most recent year with complete participation data. Sugar beets and extra long staple cotton were not considered since there were no effective acreage reduction programs for these crops.

EPILOGUE

Two of the options considered would have a limited effect because they would deal only with new projects—limiting water use on new projects and changing justification and repayment procedures for new projects. Although these options would have limited impact, the option to modify justification and repayment procedures has technical merit. Projects would be justified on the basis of expected market clearing prices; production efficiency would be improved and Treasury costs would be recovered. The procedure would introduce an element of fairness among producing regions. Further, the modification of justification and repayment procedures would establish a policy position that would deal with the reconciliation of the reclamation and commodity programs.●

THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT,  
CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. RALPH REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1984

● Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for the conference report on the reauthor-

ization of the Older Americans Act [OAA]. I regret that I was unable to be here for the actual vote. As many of you know, President Reagan was in my district touring the Timken Steel plant. This is the only new plant of its kind under construction in the entire United States. This plant is the product of cooperation between management, labor, and various levels of government. These forces combined their talents to create a source of income that not only for the people of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio, but also for others who depend on the growth of our infrastructure of which steel is an integral part. This is a fine example of people helping each other for the benefit of all, a sign of progress.

I believe that the Older Americans Act is another example of cooperation among people. The Older Americans Act represents a codification of policies designed to protect the interests of the elderly. Indeed, the existence of this legislation demonstrates our recognition of the necessity to address the concerns of the aging in America. As representatives of the people, we are entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring that all citizens' concerns are heard. The elderly have served their country well through various contributions of their time and talents. It is only fitting that we provide some level of security and comfort to them in their remaining years.

This reauthorization provides for funding for the Federal Council on Aging under title II of the act. Under titles III through VI, moneys are allocated for various community services such as supportive services and senior centers, congregate meals, education, research, and training, community service jobs, and a personal health education and training program. Moreover, this report places further emphasis on the needs of minorities so that this sector of the elderly population receives adequate assistance. Another problem that is addressed is that of elder abuse.

Certainly, the comprehensive scope of this legislation demonstrates our commitment to older Americans. I believe that the progressive nature of this legislation means that we are headed in the right direction.●

STAR WARS—FACT OR  
FANTASY?

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, as the House considers our Federal budget, it is appropriate to look at our defense priorities. In particular, I would like to discuss President Reagan's strategic

defense initiative, his Star Wars plan. In theory, Reagan's Star Wars proposal calls for a multistage missile defense program that is designed to stop Soviet missiles at different points in their trajectories. In reality, this plan is a unworkable for a number of reasons.

Of obvious concern is the effectiveness of this program: Does it really work? How reliable of a plan is it? Many leading scientists and analysts have declared that the administration's plan is not technically valid, and even Pentagon officials have expressed concern about the plausibility of constructing a successful ABM system.

The Congressional Office of Technology Assessment in its report on missile defense in space substantiates concerns about the workability of the "Star Wars" plan. The OTA states:

The prospect that emerging Star Wars technologies, when further developed, will provide a perfect or near-perfect defense system, literally removing from the hands of the Soviet Union the ability to do socially mortal damage to the United States with nuclear weapons, is so remote that it should not serve as the basis of public expectation or national policy about ballistic missile defense [BMD]. This judgment appears to be the consensus among informed members of the defense technical community.

Another aspect of effectiveness is cost. The President's proposal is a phenomenal drain on our budget. The long-term cost of this program is estimated from \$500 billion to over \$1 trillion. This is well over 125 times the total cost of the ground-launched cruise missile, and more than 20 times the cost of the controversial MX missile. Programs that aid the elderly, the handicapped, and the otherwise disadvantaged are being curtailed; effective defense programs are shortchanged; record megadeficits are rung up—we cannot keep pouring money into an impractical plan that races us toward destruction.

President Reagan claims that heightened stability will be one of the byproducts of the strategic defense initiative [SDI]. This is inaccurate on several counts. First and foremost is the erroneous implication that the Star Wars plan will lead to a dismantling of nuclear weapons, that if we can create a foolproof space defense then the use of nuclear weapons will become obsolete. On the contrary, this will encourage a competitive response from the Soviets as they try and hold their ground; their logical reaction will be to build up their own forces and thus the intensified arms race will be instigated.

This initiative, aside from being one of the most costly plans concocted thus far, undermines hope for any meaningful negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Since the ABM Treaty of 1972 there has been an understanding that ballistic missile defense systems can only

debilitate efforts toward a defense agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. This antagonistic fueling of the arms race puts the Soviets on the defensive and any serious prospects for arms moderation or international agreements will remain unrealized. Our national policy cannot proceed with an unprecedented U.S. buildup while expecting the Russians to take it lying down and comply with our demands for an arms build-down. Our nuclear arsenal must be moderated, not endlessly increased in search of a position of nuclear superiority or absolute power. Our search for this position of control will further stimulate the Soviet arms buildup as they try and match and then beat U.S. strength.

Another threat to stability that results from the Star Wars plan is the reaction within the NATO allies. There is serious concern from our allies about this program. They are worried about how it affects them. Will the United States weaken our commitment to Europe, and will these countries have to develop their own weapons systems? Such a development would further threaten stability within the alliance and between the two superpowers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Congress must critically examine this program. There is more than enough evidence and reason to halt this program. The President must be made aware that Star Wars is not a video game, not a casual venture into some kind of space adventure movie. A closer look at President Reagan's idea reveals a lack of attention to and interest in accuracy.

I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an article from the New York Times by Flora Lewis, which elaborates just how massive a mistake this program could be:

#### THE DEFENSE ILLUSION

There is an enormous gap between arguments presented to the public for the "Star Wars" program, officially called Strategic Defense Initiative, and what the experts talk about.

Debates at the annual conference of the International Institute for Strategic Studies show the gap is widening to the point of flat contradiction.

First, no one who is well informed, not the most ardent advocate, suggests that Star Wars will get rid of nuclear weapons or end the possibility of nuclear war. On the contrary, all assume nuclear arsenals will be maintained. There are conflicting views on whether they will in fact be enlarged to overcome defenses if such technologies are developed.

Second, no one pretends the best defense now conceivable can be even "nearly leak-proof," the experts' euphemism for saying a devastating number of warheads would not get through. The most optimistic claim is that 94 percent could be shot down. If that is 94 percent of 10,000, it means 600 could get through, more than enough for holocaust.

The proponents do not say deterrence can be abandoned. They say the basis of deterrence can be shifted from threat of retaliation, as now, to denying military advantage to the attacker. The reasoning is based on the assertion that the Russians do not and never would intend to attack American cities.

This insistence comes oddly from these gung-ho military specialists. But it is crucial to their position because they know they can't fool other specialists with a vision of removing the nuclear menace. So they say it must be taken for granted that a Soviet attack would only be against military targets, maybe spilling over to nearby cities but not really aiming at them.

If the Russians know they can't wipe out most of these military targets because of defenses, the argument goes, they won't attack at all. Therefore, the new deterrence is by denial, although deterrence by retaliation is preserved because Moscow would still have to fear the U.S. would strike back.

This is a strange position. If the purpose of Star Wars is only to reduce each side's missiles, not to protect people, there is a much safer, cheaper, better way of doing it: by diplomacy.

Nor do any experts take seriously President Reagan's initial suggestion, not repeated, that the U.S. might share the technology with Moscow once it is developed. That would make sure the Russians could devise better ways to beat defenses that the U.S. had spent hundreds of billions to develop.

Other problems are also emerging as the strategic implications of Star Wars are probed. The European allies are united in opposition, although the Administration sought to catch up on its original neglect of their concerns by proposing to defend them too.

American specialists complain that the Europeans are inconsistent in fearing the U.S. might grow reckless and provoke the Russians if America felt really safe, or might withdraw to its fortress and abandon them. But this is not illogic. It is two aspects of a single fear of anything that would increase the difference between the security of the U.S. and Europe.

The U.S. formed the Atlantic alliance because it had come to consider Europe its own first line of defense. Any change in that stand necessarily terrifies Europeans.

They are sensibly as frightened of conventional war with modern weapons as of nuclear war. If the U.S. thought it didn't need them any longer, they would rush for accommodation with Moscow as the only other way to assure their survival.

There are many arguments against Star Wars. The first is whether it is technically really possible, and the vast cost of finding out. But there are also fears, shared by Europeans and Americans who either oppose the idea or lean to cautious favor, of the tremendous danger during a long period of development.

The proposal does not include a companion arms control program.

It would abrogate SALT I, and without new accords it would not only expand the arms race into space. It would almost certainly accelerate competition in offensive missiles. President Reagan has admitted that combining offense and defense would appear to reach for "first-strike" capacity, the ability to destroy the other side without grave risk.

That could invite pre-emptive attack, the idiocy of launching nuclear war first so as not to be the first victim. There is really no

tolerable alternative to seeking agreement with Moscow now, before the U.S. slides down an irreversible slope. President Reagan should make the offer to the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, next week. ●

IN MEMORY OF MSGR. GENO BARONI

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Msgr. Geno Baroni, a friend, a patriot, and someone who devoted his life to the cause of social justice died on August 27 at the age of 53, after a long bout with cancer.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to three news articles that honor the memory of Msgr. Geno Baroni. The articles are from the Catholic Standard, the National Catholic Reporter, and the National Catholic News Service.

The articles follow:

[From the Catholic Standard, Washington, DC, Aug. 30, 1984]

MSGR. BARONI: FAMED PRIEST-ACTIVIST DIES, WAS SOCIAL JUSTICE CHAMPION  
(By Kaki Roberts)

A nationally acclaimed champion of working people and of urban ethnic and racial minorities, Msgr. Geno Charles Baroni, 53, died Monday at Providence Hospital after a long battle with cancer.

A priest of the Archdiocese of Washington since 1960, Msgr. Baroni was Archbishop James A. Hickey's special assistant for community affairs at the time of his death.

From humble beginnings as the son of a Pennsylvania coal miner, Msgr. Baroni was an outspoken advocate of the oppressed. His advocacy prompted a rapid rise to leadership roles in the U.S. Catholic Conference and to prominence on the national political scene as an undersecretary in the Department of Housing and Urban Development during the Carter Administration.

Mass of Christian Burial will be held Friday at 7 p.m. at St. Augustine Church, 14th and V Streets, N.W. Archbishop James A. Hickey will be the principal celebrant, and Father J. Bryan Hehir, Secretary for Social Development and World Peace of the U.S. Catholic Conference, will give the homily. There will be visitation at the church today (Thursday) from 5 to 8 p.m., with a wake service at 8 p.m. Burial will be in Husband Cemetery in Somerset, Pa., near Msgr. Baroni's birthplace.

Born Oct. 24, 1930, in a striker's shack during a union struggle in the Pennsylvania coalfields, Msgr. Baroni was the eldest child of Italian immigrants Josephine Tranquellini Baroni and the late Guido Baroni. As his activities in the years ahead were to prove, his heart always remained close to his roots in the struggles for labor and civil rights.

Msgr. Baroni's early education took place in the public schools of his birthplace, Acosta, Pa., and the regional high school. During those years, he worked after-school hours in a grocery store and on a farm. Following high school graduation in 1948 and a

summer as a laborer in a plywood factory, he enrolled in the seminary of Mount St. Mary's at Emmitsburg, Md., where he remained until his ordination in 1956.

Msgr. Baroni's first parish assignments were in Altoona, Pa., where he also taught in the Catholic high school. There he established a tradition which he was later to transplant to Washington—the celebration of working people at an annual Labor Day Mass. He also organized in Altoona the first of the many low-income credit unions which owe their existence to him, and which, years later, were to bring him an award from the National Credit Union.

After a year's service at a parish in Johnstown, Pa., Msgr. Baroni transferred his dedication to ethnic, racial and worker rights from rural Pennsylvania to inner-city Washington, D.C., where in 1960 he joined the staff of Sts. Paul and Augustine (now St. Augustine) parish. There the young priest with dark, wavy hair and intense blue eyes soon took a place in the forefront of the struggle against urban poverty and spent the next decade combining the role of parish priest with that of energetic activist in the movement to end racial discrimination.

Msgr. Baroni's activities led to his designation in 1965 as executive secretary of Cardinal Patrick O'Boyle's Commission on Community Relations. In 1967 he became founder and executive director of the Archdiocese's Office of Urban Affairs. Among his achievements in that post were the establishment of several nonprofit housing programs, including the Urban Rehabilitation Corporation which applied federal funds to the rejuvenation of decaying housing units.

His accomplishments brought recognition at the national level and Msgr. Baroni was tapped to serve from 1968 to 1970 as program director of the Task Force on Urban Problems of the U.S. Catholic Conference. There he devised the program concept and was instrumental in creating the Campaign for Human Development, the U.S. Catholic bishops' major self-help, anti-poverty program.

Pope Paul VI named him Prelate of Honor with the title of Monsignor in 1970.

1971 brought the establishment of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, an affiliate of the Ford Foundation, with Msgr. Baroni as its founder and president. The agency was one more link in his continuing efforts to promote pride in ethnic and neighborhood community cultures and to meet the housing and financial needs of the urban poor.

The object of Time Magazine kudos in 1974 as one of the nation's 200 rising young leaders, Msgr. Baroni fulfilled the periodical's prediction when on April 11, 1977, he was sworn in as assistant secretary for neighborhoods, voluntary associations and consumer protection of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Nominated for the HUD post by President Jimmy Carter, he was the first Catholic priest in U.S. history to be appointed to a sub-cabinet-level position.

His long-time advocacy of low and moderate income city dwellers was expanded in his government post where he was responsible for the formulation of government policy programs for the elderly, the handicapped, and American Indians. His job included spending long hours on Capitol Hill convincing federal legislators to pass laws benefiting these populations.

Among his major achievements at HUD were the establishment of an Office of

Neighborhood Development and working for the passage of the National Consumer Cooperative Bank program and the Neighborhood Self-Help Act.

When he resigned from HUD in 1980, Msgr. Baroni discussed his government service with a reporter for Our Sunday Visitor. His political involvement had been spurred by a belief that social issues are moral issues as well, he said.

Affluence is one such moral issue, Msgr. Baroni explained. "I think the thing to do is create a public will so we don't let affluence stop us from caring about other people," he said. "This is the real issue. We have to help people help themselves."

Msgr. Baroni held leadership roles in four White House conferences—Youth, Civil Rights, Hunger-Nutrition, and Ethnicity and Neighborhood Revitalization. He served on the boards of directors of Common Cause, National Urban Coalition, Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Foundation, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, National Committee for Full Employment, Council for Urban Economic Development, and the National Italian American Foundation.

Among the numerous awards bestowed on him were the Community Service Award given by the Office of Black Catholics in 1980, and the first Associated Catholic Charities Advocacy Award presented last October. He will be posthumously awarded the Cardinal Gibbons Award at the Archdiocese's 32nd Annual Labor Day Mass Monday. The award is given in recognition of outstanding leadership in the Church and in society on issues of social justice and human rights.

During the years of his fight against the cancer which took his life, Msgr. Baroni's face grew haggard and chemotherapy treatments left his head sparsely covered with grayed strands of hair. Yet he summoned the energy to stroll proudly, smiling to friends, along the route of the 20th Anniversary March on Washington for Jobs, Peace and Freedom last August. Then a few weeks later he brought the congregation at the 1983 Labor Day Mass to their feet as they applauded his emotion-charged homily challenging them to become "new prophets, new voices of justice."

In addition to his mother, Msgr. Baroni is survived by two brothers, Angelo Baroni and John Baroni, two sisters, Mary Halkias and Rose Hebda, and several nieces and nephews.

[From the National Catholic Reporter, Washington, DC, Sept. 7, 1984]

GENO BARONI

"I was born in a tar-paper 'strike barracks' shack in a Pennsylvania coal camp because my parents were evicted from a company house by the mine owners because my father supported John L. Lewis and was an organizer of the coal miners' right to organize into a labor union.

"My mother and father could not read or write in any language, but they were the first voices of justice in my life."

With those words Monsignor Geno Baroni talked about the fight for justice he lived and the fight with death caused by cancer he faced. For he regretted, as all Christians regret, that he had not done "enough."

To the people gathered at Sacred Heart Shrine, Washington, D.C., on Labor Day 1983, Baroni spoke of his 27 years as a priest, and of his struggle:

"Lord, I pray, help me to know that our limited charity is not enough. Lord, help me

to know that it is not enough for the church to be the ambulance service that goes about picking up the broken pieces of humanity for American society. Lord, help us all to know that God's judgment demands justice from us as a rich and powerful nation."

Geno Baroni was born Oct. 24, 1930, in Acosta, Pa., the son of Italian immigrants. He studied at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., the University of Notre Dame, the Catholic University of America and was ordained in 1956.

From 1956 to 1960, he served as an assistant pastor in Altoona and Johnstown, Pa., before coming to Washington, D.C., as assistant pastor to the city's oldest black Catholic parish, then St. Paul-Augustine, now St. Augustine's, at 15th and V Streets NW.

The exuberant Baroni took over an abandoned cloister and began the Baroni version of the social justice gospel as he understood it—a community center with "outreach" programs. His work was one more embodiment of the labor rights-based Catholic teaching arising from the social encyclicals which formed his generation of Catholic men and women.

Chance brought the young priest into contact with the social problem-solving ambitions of the early Kennedy administration. Under Robert Kennedy, a juvenile delinquency study, under David Hackett, was conducted in the neighborhood where Baroni was active.

"I had been working on a project with a teacher from the National Institutes of Health to teach infants. This was pre-Head Start. As the Kennedy people got into the juvenile delinquency studies," said Baroni, "they began to realize the problem was jobs, bad homes, poor housing—the lot, education and health care, too."

Finally the "Kennedy gang," as Baroni called them, decided they wanted trial programs in Washington. Geno Baroni became treasurer of the first Head Start, on Capitol Hill.

In 1965 he was appointed Washington archdiocesan urban affairs director. He was already serving on the district's Human Relations Council and the Mayor's Commission on Economic Development. Then came the Easter 1967 riot. Baroni would recall it as the one year he never made his Easter vigil.

Whether he experienced fear during those riots, for he was highly visible and the core of the rioting was in his neighborhood, he did not say. The fear, if such it was, set in when, as a result of his work, one black publication called him "the most important white man in Washington." Typical of the self-effacing Baroni behind the wall of confidence, he felt he could not live up to it, that he was not doing enough.

His answer was always to drive himself harder and to think bolder. He was instrumental with others in the U.S. bishops' urban crisis statement. Later, while at the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) in 1968-1970, as urban task force director, he helped bring about the Campaign for Human Development, the bishops' national self-help and antipoverty agency. He was a fellow at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

To list Baroni's involvement, from the boards of foundations to leadership roles in four White House conferences (youth, civil rights, hunger-nutrition and ethnicity and neighborhood revitalization) is to describe the man and his work:

—Board member of Common Cause, the National Urban Coalition, the Robert F.

Kennedy Memorial Foundation, the National Italian-American Foundation, the Small Business Administration national advisory council. The roll seems endless. To describe Baroni the priest is less easy. If his social conscience was evident in almost everything he worked at, his deep-seated faith and private counseling abilities as spiritual adviser were the quiet side of his nature. But one word holds both sides together—compassion.

In worldly terms, Baroni achieved his highest level under the Carter administration when he was named Assistant Secretary for Neighborhoods, Voluntary Associations and Consumer Protection—a quasi-Cabinet level post and the first ever to be held by a priest.

Baroni's influence as a priest was much in the tradition of such predecessors as Father John A. Ryan, the social activist and thinker influential in the early days of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops when it was the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and among such peers as Monsignor George Higgins, the "labor" priest.

Baroni personified the growing Catholic impact on post-World War II U.S. society and U.S. social thought—not through his writings but through his work. The book which one day will undoubtedly be written about him should set him squarely in the setting of U.S. social and political history, circa 1960s and 1970s.

He was a man of dry wit who was tested by cancer. But more, he was tested by the sadness of the injustices he saw all around him. Often he relieved that tension with amusing stories from his own life. But there was always an edge to his stories, a moral of sorts.

One lunchtime he told of his mother, in her 80s, attempting to adjust to the "new" church. Each year the young, bearded priest came by. One year he told her she had to stop eating lettuce. As Baroni recalled it, she did, but wasn't exactly certain why, except it had to do with justice. The next year it was grapes, and she went along with that, too. The third year he told her we were all responsible for the problems of the Third World. At that point Mrs. Baroni decided it was time to contact Geno.

"Geno," she said, "I think because of the changes there's no purgatory anymore. Just heaven and hell. What's this Third World?"

By leaning on humor, Baroni was able to keep going beyond the limits imposed by his cancer-ridden condition. He lived with his sister and brother-in-law in suburban Virginia while continuing on as special assistant for urban affairs to Washington's Archbishop James A. Hickey.

Baroni was, of course, correct when, in his Labor Day 1983 speech, he warned that charity was not enough. Those who knew him, however, would have liked to reassure him that as priest and citizen he nonetheless did more than his share.

[From the National Catholic News Service, Sept 4, 1984]

#### MONSIGNOR BARONI SERVED WHERE CHURCH MET WORLD, FUNERAL TOLD

WASHINGTON, NC.—Msgr. Geno C. Baroni, ethnic affairs specialist and former Housing and Urban Development assistant secretary, carried out his ministry at the edge of the church "because it was at the edge of the church that it met the world," Father J. Bryan Hehir said at Msgr. Baroni's funeral Mass Aug. 31.

Msgr. Baroni, 53, died Aug. 27 in Washington after a lengthy battle with cancer.

"Sorrow is not our posture tonight," Father Hehir, U.S. Catholic Conference secretary for social development and world peace, told the congregation at St. Augustine Church in Washington. "We can grieve the brevity of this life, but we have to celebrate its richness. It's quality over quantity this night."

More than a thousand people—white and black, poor and prominent—filled the church and flowed out onto the sidewalk. They were a picture of the constituencies Msgr. Baroni served during his life as pastor, civil and labor rights activist, community organizer and first Catholic priest to serve as assistant secretary in a cabinet-level U.S. government agency.

In a brief eulogy after the Mass, Archbishop James A. Hickey of Washington praised Msgr. Baroni as "a dear friend, a splendid priest, a valued adviser." Msgr. Baroni was named Archbishop Hickey's special assistant for community affairs in 1981.

The archbishop said: "Our Geno was a shining example of the church's commitment to work for justice, to confront the issues, to serve those in need. In what he said, in what he did, in who he was, Geno showed us how to take our social teaching off the shelf and put it to work in our communities, neighborhood and nation."

"In his first 50 years Geno taught us a lot about how to live and what to live for. And then in his three years he taught us a great deal about how to die and how in the end death is really the final healing," Archbishop Hickey said.

Father Hehir said that the friends and family of Msgr. Baroni were gathered "to celebrate his passage into the completion of the kingdom" and to "probe the ways he called to build the new kingdom now."

Father Hehir described his friend as an artist. "When you watch an artist, you see that they act by instinct . . . some things you don't teach, they are just there. Geno was an artist of the human condition who could touch human suffering in so many ways."

"Geno was sort of a priest of the nation," Father Hehir said, referring to Msgr. Baroni's national prominence.

Archbishop Hickey was principal celebrant of the Mass of Christian Burial. Retired Cardinal Patrick O'Boyle of Washington presided. Six bishops and about 40 of Msgr. Baroni's fellow priests joined in celebrating the Mass.

Democratic presidential candidate Walter F. Mondale, who worked with Msgr. Baroni during the Carter administration, said in a written statement the day before the funeral that it was "an honor and a privilege to work with Geno in many of the great struggles of his life."

Mondale said Msgr. Baroni "took on the toughest tasks in order to help the least fortunate in our society, and he fought for them with a passion for justice and a heart full of courage and compassion."

Msgr. Baroni was buried Sept. 1 in Somerset, Pa., near his birthplace. ●

BASIC RIGHTS FOR SOVIET  
JEWS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1984

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, America and the rest of the world cannot ignore the mistreatment of thousands of Jews in the Soviet Union. A great freedom that is all too often taken for granted in our country is the freedom of religion.

Unfortunately, thousands of Jews in the Soviet Union are not free to worship as they please. We have an obligation to speak for those who can't speak for themselves. We must convey our deep concern over the persecution of Soviet Jews at every opportunity. Thanks to the 1984 Call to Conscience Vigil, I have been provided with an opportunity to help those who struggle for religious freedom in the Soviet Union. The United States must stand up for the Andrei Sakharovs, and all others who are willing to sacrifice their lives for the good of all Soviet Jewry. We must not let their efforts be in vain. We must continually protest the injustices of Soviet anti-Semitic policy. I urge the Soviet Government to end its campaign of harassment of Soviet Jews, and to respect the most basic of human rights: the freedom to worship.

Just as troubling as this anti-Semitic activity in the Soviet Union is the Soviet emigration policy. A fact sheet prepared by the National Conference on Soviet Jewry sums it up nicely: "It's a tough place to live. It's a tougher place to leave." Unfortunately, emigration figures from the Soviet Union reflect this reality. In 1979, the peak year for Jewish emigration, over 51,000 Jews left the Soviet Union. Last year, barely over 1,000 Jews were allowed to leave. This is the lowest emigration figure for Soviet Jews in 12 years.

There are countless Soviet infractions of basic human rights. This is sad. But my purpose, and the purpose of many of my colleagues, is to vigorously protest the treatment of Soviet Jews, and to make the world aware of their mistreatment. Hopefully, pressure from outside sources will move the Soviets to change their oppressive policies toward Soviet Jewry.●

LET'S HELP AMERICA'S  
FARMERS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I received an excellent letter from my con-

stituent, State Representative Sam M. McElroy of Waverly, KY. State Representative McElroy serves on the agriculture and natural resource committee in the Kentucky Legislature.

As many of you know, America's farmers are still facing dire economic problems, even though our economic picture has been brightening in recent months. In 1985, Congress will consider legislation to extend or replace the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-98), a comprehensive law which governs the current operation of Federal farm programs. I hope my colleagues will carefully read Sam McElroy's suggestions for assisting farmers. His letter follows:

WAVERLY, KY, September 7, 1984.

Congressman CARROLL HUBBARD,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: I am a State Representative and serve on the Agriculture and Natural Resource Committee in the Kentucky Legislature. I would like to present some drastically needed measures to immediately curtail the disastrous farming situation confronting the farmers of America. Time is of the essence. Implementation of a plan to alleviate this situation must come at once. Much irrevocable loss to the American economy has already occurred. I fully realize the long-term programs that are needed in Agriculture, such as soil conservation programs for erosion control, development of additional export markets, preservation of the family farms, and many other problems.

The problem of farm foreclosures must be addressed immediately with forceful action. I know the Department of Agriculture and the Agriculture Committees of Congress fully realize that land has lost value and immediate action of some degree has to be taken. My recommendations for immediate action will be in two categories. One will be for land debts, and one for production loans for farmers.

First, I would like to address the burden of land debts and the loss of land values across our country's agricultural industry.

Action must be taken by United States Department of Agriculture and Agriculture Committees of Congress to work with Commercial Banks, Federal Land Banks, Production Credit Administration and other Credit Institutions in order to "Restructure Loans." This would be accomplished by:

1. 10% of debt would be written off.
2. 50% of debt would be set-aside with no interest or principal payment for 5 years.
3. 40% of a loan would stay as is and farmers will continue to pay principal and interest. This would result in the farmer paying a manageable 5% toward his total loan. This would save the family farm as we know it in this country today. No farmer can make 13 or 14 percent return on investment. If the present situation continues, farmers who owe money cannot survive. There are segments of the economy who are in a situation that allows them to stop borrowing when interest rates go up; farmers cannot. They have to have money to continue to operate.
4. The Federal Government will help Commercial and Credit Banks to restructure their loans which will result not only with assistance to farmers, but also create the dual benefit of insuring repayment of loans held by the lending institutions.
5. This would put the farmer in a more favorable situation and stop the farm foreclo-

tures, until the long range programs can be put in operation in order to have a sound agricultural economy.

6. This, in effect, is how Iacocca bailed out Chrysler. He arranged with the banks holding loans to set aside Chrysler's debt and then obtained a Federal loan. He was able to pay the Government back because he had the other debts set aside for a period of time. This allowed him time to recover and then to become once again a large taxpayer to the Federal Government.

7. Assisting farmers through this process would again make the farmer a taxpayer, raising federal revenue with which to repay federal deficits.

Secondly, I would like to present my program to solve the production loan problems that are being incurred by farmers.

United States Department of Agriculture and Agriculture Committees of Congress work with all Commercial Banks and Production Credit Administration to make production loans to all farmers in the Spring of 1985.

To address this problem farmers should be extended loans to be repaid within six months at 5% interest.

The Federal Government will pay the difference between 5% and the percent charged by banks. This difference will only be one half, since the loan is only six months. There will be three criteria that farmers must abide by in order to be eligible for these loans.

1. Farmer must participate in Set-Aside Program.

2. Farmer must take out crop insurance.

3. Since this is only for production expenses, farmers must show evidence (paid bills) that the seed, chemical and fertilizer dealers have been paid.

This program would not cost as much money for the Federal Government as is now being spent for present programs that have not proven to be cost effective.

Criterion one would insure profitable farm prices due to all farmers participating in the set-aside program. It would also greatly assist the soil conservation problems by insuring that we would have some soil conservation land on every farm each year.

Criteria two would stop all extremely costly programs for disaster loans by ASCS and Farmers Home Administration because all farmers would have crop insurance. It would also greatly strengthen the Federal Crop Insurance. It would also greatly strengthen the Federal Crop Insurance Program. This would help set-aside Farmers Home Administration, which I think is needed. I think they have gotten far too big, due to the fact that they are today the largest single bank in America.

Criteria three would insure that all banks would be paid, along with all Agribusinesses, such as seed, chemical and fertilizer dealers. Figures show that of all bills owed seed, chemical and fertilizer dealers, 30% are not paid. This is one reason for the increased costs to the other 70% of farmers.

The programs herein presented would greatly help the ills that are so prevalent in rural America today. To aid agriculture, by far the largest business in America, would do more to help our economy than anything we could do, both on the domestic as well as the foreign scene.

Thank you for your time in considering this proposal. I would be available at any time to meet with you or any committee in order to further discuss or expand on this

suggested solution to Agriculture's very complex problem.

Sincerely,

SAM M. McELROY,  
State Representative. ●

## THE MARCH OF THE MORMON BATTALION

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the following article about the Mormon Battalion whose march was one of the seminal events in southern California history.

The article follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Sept. 13, 1984]

### UNDER DESERT SUN, SOME STEPS INTO HISTORY

(By Hugh A. Crumpler)

**BORREGO SPRINGS.**—My own footsteps on the sand and stones were the only sounds in Box Canyon in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

The desert sun had cooked all cooling moisture from the air. Nothing moved.

A recurrent sense of unease followed me as I walked. I stopped. No sound. No breeze. No movement. Nothing.

I realized then that the unease was an intuitive reaction to the unfamiliar. Our senses are attuned to the perceived and subliminal sounds and movement of everyday life—of "civilization," if you prefer.

In the absence of those familiar sounds, the body's warning system was signaling: "Be alert," even though no real danger existed.

Explosive sounds filled Box Canyon one day in another century. The clatter of iron on stone, the creaking of leather harness and hickory singletrees, and the heated grunts and exclamations of men and mules floated from the narrow desert corridor.

That day was Jan. 19, 1847. The Mormon Battalion was cutting its way through Box Canyon.

Before entering the canyon, I had stopped to read the bronze marker at the turnout on Highway S2. The marker recorded that the Mormon Battalion, "using hand tools hewed a passage through the rocky walls of the narrow gorge for their wagons and opened the first road into Southern California."

Walking in the canyon made it easier for me to visualize the hardships faced by the Mormon Battalion, even though forced passage through Box Canyon was but a one-day ordeal in the battalion's 195-day march from Council Bluffs to San Diego by way of Fort Leavenworth and Santa Fe.

The Mormon Battalion was unique in American history.

It had been formed by agreement between President James Knox Polk and Mormon Leader Brigham Young. Polk probably saw the Mormon Battalion as a means of obtaining Mormon loyalty to the United States. Events had led to a wide breach between Mormons and other Americans.

Historian Wallace Stegner, in his book "The Gathering of Zion, the Story of the Mormon Trail," characterized initial reaction of rank-and-file Mormons as follows: "... after permitting bloodthirsty mobs to

drive them from their homes and kill their leader (Joseph Smith), the United States had the gall to come asking for volunteers to help it fight the war it had started with Mexico."

But Brigham Young was a pragmatist. He probably saw the battalion as a cost-free trek west for some 500 of his followers. In addition, the Mormon leader would use the pay of Mormon soldiers to help finance the westward immigration of other Mormons. He made certain that recruiting was successful.

The Mormon Battalion had two objectives. The first was to join up with Gen. Philip Kearny's Army of the West in California. The second objective was to pioneer, improve and mark a wagon trail to California.

The man who led the Mormon Battalion was not a Mormon himself. He was Lt. Col. Philip St. George Cooke, a West Pointer who had been selected by General Kearny for the onerous assignment of commanding 500 recalcitrant Mormon recruits across a thousand miles of mountain and desert.

It is not hard today to recognize the discouraging aspects of the view that greeted Cooke when he led his troops into Box Canyon in 1847. Much of the canyon appears to be a labyrinth. The viewer sees a rock wall ahead, only to find it is a jog in the canyon leading to another illusionary dead-end and still another section of canyon.

Plant life in the Canyon is typical of this desert region. It includes sagebrush, ocotillo, mesquite and yucca. I saw many barrel-cactus plants that had fallen onto the canyon floor from the slopes. Perhaps they were victims of winter rains that had loosened their footing in the rocky ground.

One interesting plant was an ancient juniper. It was wide and strong at the base, but it narrowed rapidly upward as a result of maybe a century of pruning by wind, water and fire. Man and animal, too, had probably "cut back" the growing juniper.

The only animal life I found in the canyon was of ancient origin—lizards and insects. Shadows crossing the sand came from birds flying far above the canyon.

The overwhelming impression in the canyon is of quiet and heat. With its rocky walls that sometimes seem to be closing in, Box Canyon is no place for one who suffers from claustrophobia.

When Cooke, who was a strict disciplinarian, led his men into Box Canyon he was in no mood for delay. He had spent three days, Jan. 9-11, crossing the Colorado River at Yuma. The crossing, he thought, should have taken one day.

During the crossing, the Mormons witnessed an example of Cooke's sense of humor (which they had previously observed many times before, usually without any great appreciation). A boatload of men and livestock had drifted into deep water and out of control.

When Cooke's shouted instructions had no effect on the runaway boat, he removed his hat with a flourish, bowed deeply, and asked the errant boatmen to give his regards to the folks on the Gulf of California at the mouth of the river.

After crossing the Colorado, Cooke wrote that the battalion then consisted of "360 nearly worn-out footmen" and the wagons and livestock.

The battalion crossed into present-day San Diego County on Jan. 16 after marching, as Cooke recorded, "for near three days without water... for the working animals."

Cooke was exultant when the battalion reached Carrizo Creek. He wrote on Jan. 16: "Finally, near eleven, I reached, with the foremost wagon, the first water of the Cariza; a clear running stream gladdened the eyes, after the anxious dependence on muddy wells for five or six days."

The exhausted battalion camped 15 miles beyond Palm Springs (San Diego County) on the night of Jan. 17.

On the 18th, Cooke wrote that the men "were eating their last four ounces of flour, of sugar and coffee, there has been none for some weeks. I have remaining only five public wagons... three, private property."

But there was good news before the day was over. Indian runners arrived with letters of welcome from authorities in San Diego. The letters provided a greatly-needed psychological boost.

"The men, who this morning were prostrate, worn out, hungry, heartless, have recovered their spirits tonight," Cooke wrote, "and are singing and playing the fiddle."

So it was on an upbeat note that the battalion reached Box Canyon on Jan. 19, 1847. Here is the story of that historic passage in the words of Cooke:

"... the march was resumed the 19th, with more military order, and with baggage in the rear. The guides had reported a good firm road, with a rather narrow canyon, etc."

"After marching three or four miles, up hill, I came to advance guard pioneers and guides, at a standstill.

"Weaver (a guide) coolly remarked, 'I believe we are penned up,' there was a rugged ridge in front, some 200 feet high; I ordered him to find a crossing, or I should send a company who would soon do it."

"With much active work, I got the wagons over in about an hour and a half."

"Then up the dry bed of a mountain stream, I came to the canyon and found it much worse than I had been led to expect; there were many rocks to surmount, but the worst was the narrow pass."

"Setting the example myself, there was much work done on it before wagons came; the rock was hewn with axes to increase the opening. I thought it was wide enough, and going on, found a hill to be ascended, to avoid a still narrower pass, with a great rock to be broken, before it could be crossed."

"But when a trail was made, at the first pass, it was found too narrow by a foot of solid rock. More work was done and several trails made."

"The sun was now only an hour high, and it was about seven miles to the first water."

"I had a wagon taken to pieces, and carried through."

"Meanwhile, we still hewed and hammered at the mountainside; but the best tools had been lost (in a crossing of the Gila River)."

"The next wagon body was lifted through and then the running gear, by lifting one side; then I rode on again, and saw a wagon up the very steep hill, and down again to the canyon."

"The work on the pass was perseveringly continued, and the last two wagons were pulled through by the mules, with loads undisturbed."

Cooke and his 360 men marched over the ridge and into what is now called Blair Valley. They had conquered Box Canyon in one day.

I had spent only two hours in Box Canyon. When I climbed out of the canyon and up to the roadway, I was greeted by a breeze. It was a hot breeze, but still welcome after the suspended stillness of the canyon

air. It had been nine degrees hotter in the canyon than here on the rim.

Birds sang. A car went by on S2. The sounds seemed unnaturally loud after the quiet of the canyon.

The Mormon Battalion reached Warner's Ranch on Jan. 21, two days after they had conquered Box Canyon. The march to Warner's had been uneventful, although the men were alert for trouble as Cooke had received reports that the trail was "very unsafe from hostile Californians."

At Warner's Ranch, the men of the Mormon Battalion, the true heroes of this road-blazing epic of American history, rested and ate their fill for the first time in months.

Cooke hired "Chief Antonio and ten San Luis Indians" as scouts and cattle drovers for the march ahead.

On Jan. 29, 1847, Lt. Col. Philip St. George Cooke, Army of the United States, noted the successful completion of his mission with this laconic entry in his diary:

"The evening of this day of the march, I rode down, by moonlight, and reported to the General in San Diego."

The Mormon Battalion had completed the objectives set out by President Polk: It had joined up with the Army of the West, and it had blazed a wagon road to the Pacific Ocean.

The Box Canyon road was soon abandoned for a wider wagon road. But it remains a symbol: Determination in adversity.

The men of the Mormon Battalion had it aplenty.●

#### PROTECTING MEMBERS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY AND FEDERAL PROBATION OFFICERS

##### HON. FREDERICK C. BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, without opposition, recently reported favorably upon H.R. 6272, a bill that I introduced that would make it a Federal crime to assault or kill a member of the intelligence community or a Federal probation or pretrial services officer.

H.R. 6272 has the support of those directly concerned. The Director of Central Intelligence, William J. Casey, and the Chief of the Probation Division of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Donald L. Chamlee, have written to express support for the legislation. I am including in the RECORD a copy of both letters.

In addition, the president of the Federal Probation Officers Association has written in support of the bill. His letter states that "The Federal Probation Officers Association strongly endorses H.R. 6272 and we wish that all Members of Congress would also support the passage of this legislation this congressional term."

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,  
Washington, DC, September 24, 1984.  
HON. PETER W. RODINO,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to state the support of the Intelligence Community for H.R. 6272, a bill to extend the protection of federal criminal law to Intelligence Community personnel and probation pretrial services employees.

The Executive Branch and Congress have been in agreement as to the need for legislation of this type for some time. The Intelligence Community has sought the inclusion of its personnel within the list of protected federal officials for many years. Earlier this year, Vice Admiral E.A. Burkhalter, Jr., U.S.N., Director of the Intelligence Community Staff, restated this support in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the House Judiciary Committee. Additionally, there is a long history of Congressional consideration and support of similar proposals in both the 96th and 97th Congresses. During this Congress, the Senate has twice passed similar legislation in S. 779 and S. 1762. Finally, I want to stress that the President has previously indicated his support for protection of Intelligence Community personnel. In commenting on an earlier bill containing a similar provision, the President said: "I completely support some of the features of H.R. 3963, such as the Federal Intelligence Personnel Protection Act."

This legislation is essential to ensure that Intelligence Community personnel have the same protection under current law as many other employees of the Federal Government. I commend your Committee for its support of the bill and urge its enactment.

This letter is also being sent to Chairman John Conyers, Jr., Subcommittee on Criminal Justice. The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this letter from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CASEY,  
Director of Central Intelligence.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE  
OF THE U.S. COURTS,

Washington, DC, September 26, 1984.

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,  
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONYERS: I write concerning H.R. 6272, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to extend the protection of certain assault and homicide provisions to probation officers and members of the intelligence community. The Judicial Conference of the United States and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts support this bill, which was reported favorably by your subcommittee on September 13, 1984. For over 30 years our aim has been the inclusion of U.S. probation (and in later years pretrial services) officers and employees in the protection against assault and homicide provided other Federal law enforcement personnel under 18 USC 114.

Sincerely,

DONALD L. CHAMLEE.●

#### REFRAIN FROM EMBARRASSING THE SOVIETS

##### HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, there are times to come out slugging and there are times when diplomacy is needed. President Reagan made a prudent decision to withhold public release of the alleged Soviet Arms Treaty violations found by the General Advisory Commission on Arms Control and Disarmament. If the meeting goes badly, he can release the information later. But, there is no reason to embarrass or annoy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko before the meeting. This would only reinforce the very hard lines on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Omaha World Herald eloquently argues this point. I commend it to my colleagues.

#### REPORT ON SOVIETS CAN WAIT

The people of the United States—and the world—have not had sufficient access to specific information on arms control violations by the Soviet Union.

But it might be necessary to wait some more.

Over the years, some information about Soviet violations has been leaked to the press or alluded to in speeches by some officials of the United States and other Western countries. But detailed reports of incidents in which the Soviet Union has not complied with treaties and other agreements have not been made available.

This is largely because several presidents of the United States, the signer of arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, have accepted the advice of the State Department, which has been reluctant to offend the Kremlin.

There is no evidence that this restraint in any way caused the Soviets to take their treaty obligations more seriously. In recent years, some members of Congress and others have been pushing for a release of details in order to give the public a better understanding of the nature of the Soviet Union.

President Reagan went further than some of his predecessors last January when, in a message to Congress, he referred to seven alleged or probable violations of six agreements by the Soviets.

This summer, Reagan indicated plans to send to Congress a report that reportedly details at least 18 violations occurring over the last 23 years. He received the report last January from the General Advisory Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament but has kept it secret.

Reagan's plan was to send the report to Capitol Hill and release a declassified version of it to the public in the next few days.

But the president has reconsidered and will wait until after his scheduled meeting Sept. 28 with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. The State Department reportedly persuaded Reagan to sit on the report for at least two more weeks to avoid offending Gromyko.

Said a Reagan aide: "We would be accused of purposely spoiling the atmosphere."

The decision to wait was prudent. While there is little reason to think the Gromyko meeting will produce a major breakthrough in U.S.-Soviet relations, little purpose would be served in unnecessarily embarrassing the Soviets at a time when they are showing a willingness to talk. ●

#### WHY AUTHORIZE IDA VII ON AN APPROPRIATIONS BILL?

### HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the International Development Association (IDA) is the arm of the World Bank which makes zero interest, 50 year loans to the poorest of countries. Over the years, the United States has contributed nearly \$10 billion directly to IDA. Congress is now being requested to authorize another \$2.25 billion. Yet in the past, Congress has not been allowed to address the serious policy issues regarding IDA. In 1981, the authorization of IDA VI was attached to the omnibus reconciliation bill and was not brought to a separate House vote. This year a similar effort may be made by attaching the IDA VII authorization to the 1985 continuing resolution for appropriations. Such legislative maneuvering to preclude a House vote on a most controversial issue should not continue this year. IDA issues you should be aware of include:

#### IDA LOANS TO CREDITWORTHY AND UNFRIENDLY NATIONS

Nearly 50 percent of IDA VII credits will be given to Red China and India. Red China is one of the most creditworthy Nations in the world. The People's Republic of China is among the world's top six foreign currency holders; it is buying foreign bonds at a rapid rate, and it invests heavily in foreign investments and development projects. The PRC is even directly investing funds in projects located in the United States and Japan. Even more surprising, PRC is a net creditor to the rest of the world—that is it is lending more funds to the rest of the world than it is borrowing. What is the logic of having IDA grant zero interest credits to the People's Republic of China, which turns around and provides credit to other nations at market rates of interest?

India also has access to commercial credit markets. It has the tenth largest GNP in the world and a low debt service ratio. One of the reasons for India's creditworthiness is the fact that India has shunned borrowing in private capital markets in favor of highly concessional multilateral aid. Of the \$20.6 billion in total disbursed Indian debt by 1982, only \$551 million was private market nonexport credit.

While India has been the heaviest user of U.S. taxpayer subsidized multilateral credits, it has adopted a foreign policy which is anti-American. For example, while India would not condemn the Soviets for their invasions of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Afghanistan or the shooting down of the Korean Airliner 007, India did support a United Nations resolution deploring the U.S. intervention in Grenada. Moreover, while developing close military ties with the Soviet Union, including visitation rights for Soviet warships at Indian ports, India has led efforts to restrict U.S. naval deployments in the Indian Ocean.

In light of this, I find it exceedingly difficult to justify to my constituents the U.S. appropriations to IDA which grants 50 percent of its zero interest credits to the People's Republic of China and India.

#### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST U.S. SUPPLIERS

Although the United States has provided over 33 percent of IDA funds, U.S. suppliers have only received 15.5 percent of IDA procurement disbursements. In recent years this figure has fallen even further to 12.5 percent. This compares unfavorably with countries such as the United Kingdom and Germany which each receive about 14 percent of IDA procurements, yet respectively provide only 10 percent and 11 percent of the funding. To further aggravate this situation, IDA has set up a special fund to disburse credits from which U.S. suppliers are barred from competing. This is blatant discrimination of Americans who have been IDA's largest supporters.

#### LOSS OF U.S. JOBS

For those members whose constituents in copper, other mining or heavy manufacturing industries are losing their jobs to foreign competition, part of the subsidies supporting such competition are coming from IDA. Not only has IDA supported the initial construction of these foreign plants, but once established, the facilities are turned into public works projects operating without regard to costs or to supply and demand conditions with operating subsidies obtained from the international development organizations. American workers become the marginal workers, with their taxes being used to subsidize their own competition. The most effective moment for members to voice their concern about these issues is when the authorizations for programs such as IDA are debated and amended on the floor of the House.

#### LACK OF IDA SUPPORT FOR PRO-DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

There are many activities to positively stimulate economic development which are not being promoted by IDA. First, there is private international investment. However, IDA does not penalize those nations which receive IDA funds but also nationalize and expro-

appropriate foreign investments without compensation. The United States votes against all credits to Ethiopia, because of that nation's failure to compensate Americans from that government's expropriations. Yet, Ethiopia continues to receive IDA credits. If poor nations will not even create a positive climate in their own countries to attract private capital, why should they continue to receive subsidized credits?

Second, IDA does not sufficiently encourage countries to mature out of its subsidized borrowing program. A country which consistently fails to improve the economic status of its citizens is deemed worthy for more not less subsidies. There are no timetables for maturation from IDA which depend on attainment of reasonable rates of economic growth.

Third, conditionality requirements removing host government barriers to economic growth are not sufficiently promoted. Economic growth is primarily a function of proper domestic economic policies. The carrot of subsidized loans is supposed to be the lever to obtain removal of internal policy impediments to growth. Too often nations are unwilling to change their harmful policies, and IDA proceeds to financially underwrite their inimical programs.

#### MARXIST DICTATORSHIPS

Congress has repeatedly expressed its displeasure with IDA's, as well as other international organization's, funding of Marxist Dictatorships with American taxpayer dollars. Yet we have been powerless to prevent our own aid from flowing to countries such as Ethiopia, South Yemen and Laos. Our influence over this issue is at its highest when we deliberate on the authorization of this program. Attaching IDA's authorization to a continuing resolution will not allow members the opportunity to express their dissatisfaction with this aspect of IDA.

#### UNDEREVALUATION OF AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS

Although the United States has provided over 33 percent of IDA funding in nominal terms, in hard currency our percentage is much higher. Many nations are allowed to contribute in their own, nonconvertible currencies which cannot be spent outside the donating country. Thus while the United States provides IDA with real resources, many other nations provide IDA with paper currency of little value which in any event is given back to the donating country. Taking this factor into account, the ratio of donations to procurement contracts is even worse for the United States than the 33 percent (donations)/15.5 percent (contracts) ratio discussed above.

In terms of voting power, the situation is much worse. For its 33 percent of the contributions, the United States

is allowed 19.54 percent of the votes. However, for 109 third world countries who only contribute 4.68 percent of the total—and most of that in restricted, nonconvertible currencies—these nations receive 36.62 percent of the vote.

## UNREALISTIC CREDIT TERMS

Due to inflation, the subsidy element of IDA credits has increased sharply. IDA credits are for a term of 50 years and carry a zero interest rate. When market interest rates were around 5 percent, a healthy subsidy was involved. However, since rates have increased to the 10 percent to 15 percent range, a healthy subsidy has grown into an enormous one. While the World Bank has sought to index its other loans to market conditions, no similar adjustment has been made for IDA. Unless we want to allow inflation to significantly continue to alter the program, we should change the program's term to allow for shorter maturities, avoidance of negative real interest rates and accelerated paybacks when nations mature to harder, less concessional loans.

Unfortunately, in the past the debates and votes over IDA were primarily concerned with the level of the contribution to IDA. Either you were for a particular level of funding—and thus were a supporter of IDA—or you were considered an opponent of IDA. However, I am suggesting there are important policy considerations pertaining to IDA, independent of the level of funding. If the House is not allowed to consider the authorization of IDA as a separate issue, we will lose the opportunity to make our voices heard on these and other important policy issues.●

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

## HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was in Ohio on September 19 and 26, and was prevented from casting three votes. Had I been present, my votes would have been:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1984

Roll No. 403, House Resolution 579, providing for consideration of H.R. 3082, Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1983; "yea."

Roll No. 404, conference report on on H.R. 3755, Social Security Disability Benefits Reform Act of 1984; "yea."

SEPTEMBER 26, 1984

Roll No. 423, conference report on S. 2603, Older Americans Act Amendments of 1984; "yea."●

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET  
REFUSENIKS

## HON. STEVE BARTLETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1984

● Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I speak today on behalf of individuals whose situation may seem distant from the ongoing domestic policy issues, ranging from the budget to educational standards, that are currently facing this country. While we must focus our attention on these and other extremely important problems, there is another matter which cuts to even more profound issues than the crucial legislative questions currently under discussion in this distinguished body: that is the plight of the Soviet "Refuseniks." As I address the House today as part of the Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jewry, I must emphasize that when one speaks of the Refuseniks, one is referring to persons who cannot openly discuss or participate in freedoms we take for granted in the United States, basic freedoms of peaceful assembly, cultural identification, and religious expression. I speak now for those who would be silenced by the Soviet Government simply for attempting to retain that most basic of human dignities, the maintenance of cultural and religious beliefs which greatly comprise one's personal identity.

As I am sure many of my colleagues are aware, since the 1970's, the Soviet Union has placed increasingly severe restrictions on the practice of Jewish culture within its borders. The mere act of reaffirming one's religious heritage, whether through prayer or religious instruction, has met with arrests and harsh punishment by Soviet authorities. On this day, I seek to honor and focus attention on the plight of Soviet Refuseniks, Soviet Jews who have applied for exit visas for the purpose of family reunification or freedom of religious expression abroad, and who have repeatedly been turned down as part of the ongoing practice or religious intolerance within the Soviet Union.

The flow of Soviet Jews to Israel and the West is now down to a trickle. The year 1983 was the most disappointing year in at least a decade for Jewish emigration. According to recent figures, approximately 1,300 Jews left the Soviet Union in 1983, down from a peak of well over 50,000 in 1979. With this descent of a new "iron curtain" on Jewish emigration, persecution of Jews has intensified internally within the Soviet Union, with Jews placed on trial for attempting to emigrate or to promote Jewish customs and religious work.

Prisons, labor camps, and internal exile have all been meted out to those who have expressed yearnings for fundamental religious freedom and who have had the courage to pursue this freedom in the face of frustrating bureaucratic obstacles and interferences. Refuseniks now in prisons or labor camps have endured restrictions on or rescinding of correspondence and visitation rights.

Additionally, there are reports that unreasonable labor quotas and physical punishment are common, with the weak and disabled special targets for such abuse. Typically, either no reason at all or sketchy justifications are given for denying a Refusenik an exit visa. "Security risk" or "lacking parental consent" are typical labels applied to the cases of Refuseniks, even when such designations are blatantly inappropriate.

Some Refuseniks, such as Andrei Sakharov and his wife, Elena Bonner, have become "nonpersons," frozen out of Soviet society and professionally ostracized. Refuseniks may abruptly lose their jobs or schooling and generally be forced to live on the fringes of their own communities. Like Mr. Sakharov, many refuseniks suffer demotions, with titles and degrees withdrawn and professional works subject to open plagiarization.

This cruel treatment is delivered simply because some individuals dare to engage in what we, in the United States, take to be an unspoken, yet deeply important, right, the ability to pray to God in the tradition of our fathers and grandfathers before us. As citizens of this great country, we are fortunate indeed that the Founding Fathers had the foresight to embrace and protect the principle of religious freedom within the Constitution.

The refusenik I have adopted, Aron Bukhman, does not enjoy such liberty and endures constant harassment, along with other members of his family, because of their desire to emigrate and practice their religion freely and openly. He was denied permission to emigrate on the pretext that his military service, which ended over 15 years ago, made him privy to sensitive military information. Such misrepresentations of fact are merely disguises for the true reasons behind such responses, primarily the intention of the Soviet Government to repress religious conviction and independence among refuseniks such as Aron Bukhman, Andrei Sakharov, and countless others.

Today, I speak for those who have been censured in their capacity to present their disturbing experiences to those outside the Soviet Union who are willing to listen. We must remember the courage of the refuseniks to retain a distinct identity within a society that constantly attempts to con-

form the thoughts and outlook of its citizenry to a monolithic and uncritical standard. We must also continue to work for increased recognition of the efforts of the refuseniks and for an improvement of their circumstances. ●

## PIK PROGRAM CAUSES HARD- SHIP TO AGRICULTURAL SUP- PORT INDUSTRIES

**HON. IKE SKELTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 years ago, our Government established the Payment-In-Kind Land Diversion Program of 1983 (known as PIK) which took one-third of our cropland out of production and reduced existing surpluses of stored grain. The PIK Program also caused hardship to hundreds of agricultural support industries that are vital to our continued world leadership in agricultural productivity. When farmers don't plant and harvest, then they don't need fertilizer, chemicals, seeds, fuel or machinery. Businesses providing those products or services suffered a loss from which some may never recover. Hearings were held on this subject and finally, this past April, legislation was passed to reactivate the non-physical disaster loan program offered by the Small Business Administration to provide loans (not grants) from existing but unused disaster funds.

What has happened since then is a textbook example of this administration's disregard of the needs of the farmers, agri-business, and rural America and their contempt for the will of this Congress. Though regulations already existed for this loan program, 6 more months were wasted under the guise of needing to draw new regulations. The new regulations make it next to impossible for any PIK affected business to receive a loan. I would like to include in the RECORD my comprehensive comments to the SBA concerning these proposed regulations as well as the comments of other groups that were affected by PIK.

The administration's clever manipulation of this nonphysical disaster loan program through the Administrative Procedures Act and the implementing regulations has played a cruel trick on these ailing agricultural support businesses. It offers help for which no one can qualify. The sad part is, that in the long run, when the Government takes action that harms agricultural industries, the joke is on us.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 20, 1984.

Deputy Associate Administrator for Disaster Assistance,

U.S. Small Business Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. KULIK: This letter is intended to comment on the proposed rule that would add parts 123.50 through 123.53 to 13 CFR. These regulations would implement P.L. 98-270 section 302 which authorizes the reactivation of the Small Business Act section 7(b)3 loan program and provides \$100,000,000 funding per year for three years. More specifically, these comments will address the regulations as they implement section 308 of P.L. 98-270 which clarified that, for purposes of the 7(b)3 loan program, the Payment-in-Kind Land Diversion Program of 1983 constitutes federal action.

### THE PROPOSED RULE IN GENERAL

The stated reason for delaying the implementation of the non-physical disaster loan program passed by Congress five months ago, was that new regulations were needed in the event that a huge, unquenchable demand for these loans exists that would overwhelm the Small Business Administration (SBA) and exceed the \$100,000,000 per year ceiling set by Congress. (See Compilation of Presidential Documents, volume 20, number 16, page 571; and the Federal Register, volume 49, Number 163, page 33198, bottom of the second column.)

There is no credible evidence that has been provided to Congress that tends to indicate that the \$100,000,000 ceiling is unnecessarily low. In the last ten years of the existence of the 7(b)3, 7(b)4, 7(b)5, 7(b)6, 7(b)7, 7(b)8, and 7(b)9, loan programs, when reviewed all together the \$100,000,000 level was only exceeded twice, and by small margins. For eight of those ten years the total lending was substantially below the \$100,000,000 level. P.L. 98-270 reactivates only one small part of the past 7(b) loan system. (See enclosure #1 for the record of all disaster loans approved from 1971 through the third quarter of 1983.) Finally, the funds on hand to be loaned and Congress set a ceiling, so fears of a runaway loan program are unfounded. It should be noted in addition that, in spite of the complex qualification scheme established as a control by these proposed rules, the SBA acknowledges that they may ultimately have to rely on a first come first served selection method anyway. It makes one wonder if all these regulations and all the delay were necessary in the first place.

There is, on the other hand, an abundance of evidence that there is an immediate need for loans to those agricultural support businesses damaged by PIK. Their 7(b)3 program received full consideration by the Small Business Committee and the faster it can be implemented, the more effective it will be. (Enclosure #2 for your record, is a copy of the transcript of the hearing held by my Small Business Subcommittee entitled "The PIK Program and its Effect on Agricultural Support Businesses".)

Finally, basing eligibility for the loans on extraordinary, sudden and temporary dislocation in a county or other political subdivision bears very little relationship to which businesses are actually hurt by the PIK program. These kinds of criteria will weed out

September 28, 1984

potential participants who are no less qualified than others save for technical geographic or historical local economy grounds. That policy seems unfair.

### COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC SECTIONS OF THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS

**Substantial Economic Injury:** Section 123.51(b) lists two criteria 'conditions of business' necessary to qualify for a loan: inability to market a product or substantial economic injury. It has been almost two years since the PIK program started so we can assume that anyone who could not market a product is, by now, bankrupt; therefore substantial economic injury' is the operative phrase for PIK 7(b)3 loan applicants. Section 123.52 defines 'substantial economic injury' as a 40 percent decrease in profit or cash position when compared to a similar period in a previous year. The previous year, 1982, was a disastrous one for the farm community, throughout the midwest. In Missouri, for example, floods and a tornado lead to agricultural disaster declarations. As a result, some agricultural support businesses were coming off a bad year when the PIK program took effect. Having them prove now that their profits dropped another 40 percent in 1983 would not truly reflect their difficulty. Perhaps an average profit over a three year period could be substituted.

**Acreage by Political Subdivision:** Part 123.51(c) requires that the county in which a directly affected business is situated must have either 20 percent or more of its available farm acreage diverted from production by the PIK program. There are several problems with this. First, there is a difference between 'available farming acreage' and cropland that provides a market within the county for an agricultural support industry. Farming acreage, according to the ASCS, could include pastures, woodland, or other areas unsuitable for crops. No county in Missouri, for example, would qualify under this definition. Furthermore, few farm support industries observe county lines or even state lines in providing their product or service. Many of the affected businesses such as harvestors or fertilizer spreaders travel widely to fill their customer needs. Under the proposed regulations, no consideration will be given to their lost business unless these businesses are fortunate enough to live in a county that had a 20 percent reduction. To use Missouri as an example, even if 'available farm acreage' were re-defined to mean cropland, only 50 percent of our farming counties would qualify.

**Certification by Governor:** Section 123.51(d) requires that the Governor certify that 25 businesses in the county of an applying business have substantial economic injury and that these 25 need aid that they cannot get from other sources. Either a business was hurt by the loss of customers due to the PIK program or it was not. In the case of the PIK program, there is no good reason why the Governor must certify that there are other businesses in an affected county that were also hurt.

The Congress, by P.L. 98-270 specifically established that the PIK program was federal action. The relevant consideration should be damage to an individual business not a body count of businesses per county.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. As presently constituted, these regulations would have the effect of denying eligibility to many of the businesses we

in Congress intended to assist. It is my hope that we can make the necessary changes and bring this program on line as quickly as

possible while there is still time to do some good.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,  
Member of Congress.

## DISASTER LOAN APPROVALS

(Dollars in millions)

Fiscal year	Home		Business <sup>1</sup>		Farm		Nonphysical	
	Number	Dollar	Number	Dollar	Number	Dollar	Number	Dollar
1971	52457	\$196.9	4932	\$101.0			404	\$41.0
1972	88834	251.1	4375	56.2			469	52.8
1973	192758	871.2	22063	630.2			539	62.9
1974	45156	193.0	5678	150.2			606	66.9
1975	7513	48.0	1834	73.9			1465	145.8
1976	17480	69.6	2928	65.3			384	68.8
1977	4376	58.3	522	41.2			69	17.5
1978	12901	106.4	5090	181.1	798	\$41.1	343	46.8
1979	74546	360.3	10932	335.3	46792	1827.3	497	46.6
1980	48386	268.0	5280	209.9	15592	897.3	229	33.6
1981	52395	372.2	10359	384.3	5650	361.2	1691	118.1
1982	23510	163.1	15944	824.8	15234	886.6	709	49.2
1983	7866	81.6	1550	72.1	368	83.2		
1983 (8/1)	8289	89.8	1668	72.6	3	7		

<sup>1</sup> Includes economic injury loans.

THE FERTILIZER INSTITUTE,  
Washington, DC, September 19, 1984.  
Re Disaster Loans Subpart D, 13 CFR, Part 123

Deputy Associate Administrator for Disaster Assistance,  
Small Business Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR SIR: The Fertilizer Institute (TFI)<sup>1</sup> commends the Small Business Administration for moving quickly to implement rules governing disaster loans for small businesses that suffered losses due to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's 1983 Payment-In-Kind (PIK) Program.

<sup>1</sup> TFI is a voluntary, non-profit association whose members represent approximately 95 percent of the domestic fertilizer production in the United States. TFI's membership includes producers, manufacturers, traders, retail dealers and distributors of fertilizer materials who are a vital link in America's agricultural food chain.

American farmers took 83 million acres out of production to participate in the PIK program. The effect on small farm input businesses—such as fertilizer, feed, equipment and agri-chemical dealers—was disastrous. Many businesses, caught with high inventory levels, had no choice but to close facilities and lay off employees. For some, the impact was of such magnitude that their only alternative was declaring bankruptcy. Thus, implementation of SBA's economic injury loan program for PIK-impacted rural agri-businesses is needed now.

TFI has reviewed SBA's proposed rules to administer PIK-related disaster loans that appeared in the Federal Register, Tuesday, August 21, 1984. We submit the following comments for SBA's consideration.

Included in SBA's proposed rule is the requirement that the governor of each state must certify that at least 25 small business concerns have directly suffered substantial economic injury in a county and are in need of financial assistance which is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. As required by other SBA disaster loans, we support the requirement that the governor be involved in the disaster preparation.

However, the requirement that at least 25 small businesses be affected before economic injury is found is too restrictive for SBA's PIK-impacted loan program. In rural areas, there may be no more than 5 to 6 farm input businesses per county. If SBA main-

tains this high requirement certification level, very few, if any, businesses seriously impacted by the PIK program will be unable to participate in the loan program simply because the governor cannot certify 25 impacted businesses.

In its proposal, SBA indicated that the number 25 was selected to conform with the existing definition of substantial impact. Indeed, a governor of the state must certify that 25 homes or businesses have been impacted in making a physical disaster declaration (49 CFR, 123.23). However, a physical disaster declaration includes not only businesses but also individual homes or a combination of both. USDA's PIK program only affected farm input businesses. Thus, we question using the 25-business minimum requirement before economic injury is found.

SBA should lower the certification level to five (5) small businesses as outlined in SBA's regulations 49 CFR, 123.24(C). In this provision, when a disaster damage is insufficient for a major disaster declaration, the governor of the state in which the disaster occurred may certify to SBA that at least five (5) small business concerns have suffered economic injury and are in need of financial assistance not otherwise available on reasonable terms. We submit that such a certification level more appropriately reflects the economic injuries suffered under the PIK program.

Sincerely,

GARY D. MYERS.

AG-ONE SEEDS,

Delavan, WI, August 27, 1984.

Re Comment to SBA 13 CFR Part 123 Disaster Loans, proposed rule as applies to PIK

Deputy Associate Administrator for Disaster Assistance,  
Small Business Administration,  
Washington, DC.

We are a seed company who had an extremely negative impact due to the 1983 Payment-in-Kind program. Our economic loss due to PIK was in excess of 60% and was the cause of a reorganization of our company under Chapter 11 of the Federal Bankruptcy code.

We were very encouraged after hearing of the passage of Public Law 98-270, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1984. However, in checking further with an official of the SBA Disaster Relief unit in At-

lanta, Georgia, we find that we do not qualify because "county" eligibility is a limiting requirement. We, like most companies marketing hybrid corn, cannot confine our activities to one county or even to one state, yet we were impacted most severely by PIK and cannot qualify for even modest relief through a program which specifically addresses the Payment-in-Kind program.

Our company is not the only seed company who has been damaged by the Federal Government in this manner. There must be a way that this program can be of benefit to us by providing relief for an act that was certainly a disaster as far as our small business goes.

The Federal Government helped to cause our dilemma, will the Federal Government now come to our aid?

We need assistance immediately as a matter of survival.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. BRITT,  
Ag-One Seeds President, Headquarters. ●

## THE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1984

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has vowed that "the United States will continue to view human rights as the moral center of our foreign policy. Our hope is for a time when all the people of the world can enjoy the blessings of personal liberty." He will have an opportunity to act on the hope when he meets with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko today.

Jews in the Soviet Union do not enjoy the blessings of personal liberty. The bleak situation faced by Jews in the Soviet Union clearly exhibits a callous Soviet disregard for basic human rights. Antisemitism is officially sanctioned in the Soviet Union. And in recent years there has been a dramatic decrease in Jewish emigration, which

has effectively trapped 2½ million Soviet Jews. In several cases, continuous Soviet harassment has prevented them from even communicating freely with friends and relatives overseas.

Americans are rightly concerned about the individuals who are suffering, many for several years, at the hands of their Soviet persecutors. A few special cases have recently come to my attention.

Aleksander Kholmiansky, once a computer scientist, now works as a janitor. He had been warned that his Hebrew teachings should cease. On July 25, he was arrested on the testimony of a "friend." He was sentenced to 10 days for trampling on flowers, but wasn't released. On August 29, the KGB searched his apartment and "found" a pistol. His brother was mugged in Moscow, and his whole family has been under attack. A few days ago, he was placed on trial on charges of mailbox tampering.

Yakov Levin, even though he is 25 years old has been denied emigration repeatedly because of parental disapproval. Levin is a Hebrew teacher. His home has been searched and his books have been confiscated. He has been warned to stop seeing his fiancée, Yehudit Nepomniashchy, whose family is also active in trying to emigrate.

Mark Rakovsky, his wife Sofia and their children Yanna and Edward have been waiting 9 long years to emigrate. They have repeatedly applied and have been repeatedly denied exit visas without ever having been given a reason.

Erlena Matlina was once a distinguished professor in Moscow, internationally known for her work. In 1979, she applied for exit visas to Israel to be reunited with her brother and sister. Three years later she was officially denied on the incredible grounds of insufficient kinship. As a result of her application, she was fired from her position. Neither she nor her husband, Simeon, have been able to find a regular job since. Professor Matlina now makes scarves as her only means of support. Her entire family has been reduced to poverty.

As Americans, and as fellow human beings, it is our duty to speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves. Human dignity and religious freedom should be observed in every society.

We must not rest until these brave men and women are free of Soviet oppression and their human dignity and religious freedom are restored. Their struggle is our struggle. I have only mentioned a fraction of those who are yearning to leave. The Soviet Jewry issue must be placed prominently on President Reagan's agenda of topics to discuss with Foreign Minister Gromyko. I urge my colleagues to join me in calling upon the Soviet Union to set free these brave men and women.●

#### IN MEMORY OF HIGH CHIEF FANO SHIMASAKI

#### HON. FOFU I.F. SUNIA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. SUNIA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak in memory of a friend, High Chief Fano Shimasaki of American Samoa, whose untimely passing last week was mourned by the Government and people of the Territory of American Samoa.

A few years ago, Chief Fano was a colleague of mine in the territorial senate. There I learned from him the value of being simple, humble, yet forceful in the search for a desired goal. Indeed, this chief was the exemplification of the "river that ran deep"—silent but deep. Fano was more than just another high chief or senator in our territorial Fono, he was truly a gentleman.

When John F. Kennedy sent H. Rex Lee as Governor to American Samoa in response to the Reader's Digest charges that the territory was "America's shame in the South Seas," improving health services was one of the major goals. A Yale study group pinpointed Fano family lands in the village of Faga'alu as the best site for a major health facility. Chief Fano practically gave away the land for free—several acres with the best location on the island—to the Government for the hospital which today proudly bears the name of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The chief was head of the Fano family, the village of Faga'alu, and the Shimasaki family business. He was the last surviving son of Masaitchido "Frank" Shimasaki, one of our territory's first businessmen from Japan. His mother, Solinuu, held the title "Fano" as one of the first chieftesses to become a senator in American Samoa.

Chief Fano was a deacon of the Faga'alu Christian Congregational Church. He was dedicated to his church.

When he retired in 1975, he began to spend more time with the family business—and also at the golf course. I played with him many times, and his strategy in play mirrored his strategy in life. He did not hit very far, but straight, managing a par more times than not. "The object of this game," he used to tell me, "is to sink the ball in the number of shots allowed for that hole." That philosophy took him far and served well in life.

In ceremonies appropriate to his rank, and as a high chief who once served in the senate, High Chief Fano was honored by the Fono with the traditional service in the Chamber before his final trip to rest in the village where he was born, Faga'alu.

I join many of my constituents in extending to his widow, Lydia, and the Fano family my deepest sympathies and condolences.●

#### LEGISLATION TO CURB FORMER PRESIDENTS' BENEFITS BE- COMES A NATIONAL PRIORITY

#### HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, after much deliberation, I am introducing legislation to limit the escalating costs associated with benefits for our former Presidents. Although I am a strong supporter of America's highest public office and do not wish to diminish its importance or dignity, I am concerned about the increasing costs we, as taxpayers, are being asked to pay.

Current benefits for the three living former Presidents, for one Presidential widow, and for Presidential libraries, will cost taxpayers \$29 million in this fiscal year. In 1955, the cost was \$64,000. In addition, former Presidents are entitled to full Secret Service protection, 24 hours a day for life. Their spouses receive full protection for life or until they remarry, and their children receive protection until they reach age 18. Current Presidential libraries range from less than 30,000 square feet for President Hoover's library to more than 110,000 square feet for President Johnson's in Austin, TX. Although these libraries are constructed with privately donated funds, they are operated and maintained by the Federal Government. Finally, office allowances for former Presidents are currently set at \$300,000.

Although I supported an amendment to H.R. 5798, the Treasury appropriations bill for fiscal year 1985, cutting \$890,000 from the \$1.7 million fund used to pay for pensions, staffs, and other expenses, it was ultimately rejected. However, \$147,000 was finally deleted from the fund with my support and approval. While this amendment was an important first step, additional action must be taken. That is why I am introducing today the Former President's Benefits Containment Act of 1984.

My bill requires the administrator of General Services to ensure that Presidential libraries maximize the space allocated to them. Each President is limited to one library no larger than 40,000 square feet. The administrator cannot accept any land, building or equipment unless an endowment has been established which will provide sufficient income to cover all administrative and operational costs.

Title II places an authorized cap on all staff, office, travel expenses, and

communications services at \$250,000 for each of the first 4 fiscal years, \$175,000 for the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth fiscal years, and \$100,000 for each subsequent fiscal year. Former Vice Presidents are limited to those services and facilities necessary to winding up their affairs. Funds provided under this act may not be used for partisan political activities or income generating activities. An exception is made, however, for Presidential memoirs that are exclusively printed and sold by the Public Printer.

Title III limits Federal protection of a former President to 5 years, protection of a former President's widow or widower to 6 months and only provides incidental protection to the spouse or minor child of a former President. This protection may be reinstated, however, upon a finding that a serious threat to the individual exists. Protection of a former Vice President can only be authorized upon written request and based on the finding of a serious threat.

This is a comprehensive approach to an increasingly difficult problem. I believe my legislation strikes a balance between America's respect for the Presidency and its legitimate concern for the costs of these benefits. I urge my colleagues to strongly support this measure. ●

REVISED AND EXTENDED REMARKS ON ENHANCEMENT OF THE SAVINGS AND LOAN SYSTEM

HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to strengthen the facilities of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. I offer this legislation to encourage and provoke discussion and consideration of steps which need to be considered early in the next Congress to reform our deposit insurance system.

Earlier this year, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board published proposed regulations which would have the effect of sharply restricting the direct investment activities of federally insured State-chartered associations in several States. Along with many others—both in and out of Congress—I filed a formal letter with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board objecting to these proposed regulations. My objections were that the use of generalized regulations were to me inappropriate in circumstances where specific supervisory actions seemed to be indicated; and, furthermore, I was greatly troubled by the imposition of Federal regulations which overrode legislative de-

terminations made in various States, and was thus sharply at variance with our longstanding traditions of dual Federal and State regulation of depository institutions.

I do, however, understand the concerns which underlie the proposed actions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; namely, the dilution of the financial resources of the FSLIC which has occurred over the past several years, due to a variety of problems that have beset the thrift industry. I agree with the Directors of the Home Loan Bank Board that there is need for the Congress to direct its attention to specific legislative actions aimed at strengthening the insurance fund of the FSLIC, as well as assisting the Board in developing enhanced capacity for effective supervision.

The bill which I have introduced today proposes three separate actions designed to contribute to the overall strengthening of the Federal savings and loan insurance system. This proposed legislation grants to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the authority to establish minimum standards of supervisory practice to be achieved by State agencies regulating federally insured State-chartered savings and loan associations. As an incentive to encourage States to comply with these Federal minimum standards, the bill provides that associations operating in States which do comply will be permitted, if mandated by State law, to undertake investment activities up to 40 percent of total assets, even if such activities are not authorized for federally chartered associations. This provision endeavors to maintain the historic right of States to authorize activities for their chartered financial institutions which may be of a different type and character than permitted federally chartered institutions, but at the same time gives the Federal regulators some real leverage in establishing acceptable supervisory practice by State regulatory agencies for those institutions which benefit from Federal deposit insurance.

A second provision of the proposed regulation gives the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the express authority to undertake an experimental program of risk-related deposit insurance premiums. This program would be authorized until July 1, 1986, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board would be required to report to the Congress on the operating results of the program and to provide the Congress with a recommendation as to whether permanent authority should be granted for a program of risk-related deposit insurance premiums. Unquestionably, if we can find a practice and effective means for implementing a system of deposit insurance premiums related to the varying degrees of risk among deposit institutions, we will have made a solid step in the direction of strength-

ening the financial resources of the deposit insurance system.

As a further effort to give immediate strength to the FSLIC, the proposed legislation authorizes the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to call upon the Federal Home Loan banks to transfer up to 50 percent of their capital and surplus to the primary reserve of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. This provision is but to serve as a further backstop, along with the existing authority to call upon the Treasury, to sustain public confidence in the capacity of the FSLIC to perform its stated mission. Obviously, this provision contemplates that such a call upon the capital and surplus of the individual Federal Home Loan banks would only occur in the context of a genuine financial emergency. For this reason, the provision requires that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board could only exercise this emergency authority in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.

I wish to emphasize that my primary aim in introducing this legislation is to provoke serious discussion and thought about practical and reasonable steps which we can take in the next Congress to augment the resources of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. I share the concerns of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board on this important financial issue, but I am most anxious that we seek answers to this problem which, if at all possible, avoid the knee-jerk resort to generalized regulation. I do not think that approach is effective; indeed, I believe that approach delays our moving to take the steps which are necessary to enhance the capacity of effective supervision by both Federal and State agencies and strengthen the financial reserves which undergird our deposit insurance system. I pledge that the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer, and Monetary Affairs of the Committee on Government Operations will be giving active attention to the related issues of effective supervision and a strengthened and modernized deposit insurance system, and I know that both the House and Senate Banking Committees can be expected to give high priority attention to this critical subject matter. ●

IN HONOR OF JUDGE ALMERIC CHRISTIAN

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, many people seek justice in this world by having their day in court. But let me tell you of a judge who recently had his day in court. The Honorable Almeric Christian, chief judge of the District Court of the U.S. Virgin Islands, was feted by his colleagues and associates, by lawyers, and law clerks on August 9 in recognition of his appointment to the bench 15 years ago.

Judge Christian, joined by his wife, Shirley, and children, Adam and Rebecca, received the congratulations of well-wishers in the court chamber, congratulations that were cloaked in verdicts that were unanimous—Judge Almeric Christian is objective and strong, learned and fair.

Judge Christian's notoriety over these past 15 years is recognized by everyone residing in the Virgin Islands, and he will always be viewed as someone who brought beneficial changes to our community and, most of all, who upheld the ideals of liberty and justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives join with me in honoring this esteemed member of our judicial system. The following editorial in the Daily News of the Virgin Islands says it best when it comes to offering the recognition that is due Judge Almeric Christian:

The editorial follows:

HEAR YE, HEAR YE

They came to praise Almeric Christian, not to bury him, and though the good judge twitted the speakers for delivering remarks that resembled eulogies, he clearly was touched by the tributes paid him by fellow judges, lawyers and friends last week.

The occasion was the 15th anniversary of his appointment to the bench by President Richard M. Nixon. It was a simple ceremony in Christian's own courtroom at the Federal Building, a ceremony thrust on him by colleagues who wanted to take historic note of a milestone—and a man who has touched everyone in these islands.

"He's had more impact on the lives of the people of the Virgin Islands in the last 15 years than any other single individual—and that, in fact, has been for good," said fellow District Court Judge David O'Brien.

That, in our view, is a fair assessment.

And so were the assessments offered by other speakers:

Of Almeric Christian the judicial giant, a learned man whose legal scholarship, eloquence, and sense of fairness would have made him an outstanding judge anywhere.

Of Almeric Christian the Virgin Islander, who wants the best for his people.

Of Almeric Christian the man of strength and principle, standing firm in his defense of the Bill of Rights and refusing to bend to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

public pressure even in the face of torrential windstorms of criticism.

Of Almeric Christian the person, sometimes cantankerous, sometimes loving, as demanding of others as he is of himself, a bit of a sexist but liberated enough to push women to open new doors for themselves, a man of wit and honor.

Though we, like everyone at last week's ceremony, have disagreed with Judge Christian on specific issues and decisions, we have done so with respect and admiration. He is not, after all, infallible, a fact that this fine man and outstanding jurist would be the first to admit.

We join his well-wishers in hoping for many more years of Almeric Christian's continued service to this community. It has, indeed, been very much for the good.●

DYMALLY ANNOUNCES INSTITUTE FOR SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY AWARDS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the Members that on October 2, 1984, the Research Institute for Space, Science and Technology will hold an awards banquet to honor a number of people who have made outstanding contributions to the area of science policy and to the application of scientific research to technical development. Among those being honored are three of our most outstanding colleagues in the Congress: Mr. WINN, Mr. FUQUA, and Mr. TSONGAS. The awards banquet will also serve to launch the Institute, which will be dedicated to nonpartisan research in the area of public policy for science and technology. I wish to submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the press release which gives further details about the awards and the Institute.

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SPACE, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ANNOUNCES HIGH TECHNOLOGY WEEK AWARDS BANQUET

The Research Institute for Space, Science and Technology today announced the names of those who will receive distinguished achievement and service awards at a Washington, D.C. banquet on October 2 in celebration of National High Technology Week.

A total of 10 awards will be presented for outstanding achievements in the fields of energy research, communications, computer science, bio-medical technology, robotics, nuclear research, and aerospace engineering and exploration.

Three additional awards will be presented to members of Congress for exceptional public service on behalf of the science and technology communities.

The awards banquet and ceremonies are a means of initiating National High Technology Week, which was established by a joint resolution of the 98th Congress. The resolution was sponsored by more than 200 members of the Congress and was recently signed by the President.

September 28, 1984

These achievement and service awards will be presented at a dinner the evening of October 2 at the Washington Hilton Hotel in the District of Columbia. Guests at the dinner will include Members of Congress, senior officials of the Federal government, high technology industry representatives, executives of trade and professional associations, university and foundation executives.

The proceeds of the \$250-a-plate banquet will provide initial funding for the newly created Institute for Space, Science and Technology, a non-profit organization created by Rep. Mervyn M. Dymally and others. The Institute will foster better communication between the private sector and government on major issues of public policy in the areas of science and technology.

Awardees from the private sector will include:

1. Dr. Lewis M. Branscomb, Vice President and Chief Scientist of IBM Corporation.
2. Dr. Irving S. Johnson, Vice President of Lilly Research Laboratories.
3. William C. Norris, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Control Data Corporation.
4. Dr. Chauncey Starr, founding President and now Vice Chairman of the Electric Power Research Institute.
5. Joel Slutzky, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Odetics, Inc.
6. Dr. Alwin E. Nashman, President, Systems Group, Computer Sciences Corporation.
7. Dr. Sally K. Ride, Astronaut, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
8. Dr. Walter Massey, Vice President of Research Programs, the University of Chicago.
9. The Scientists of Bell Laboratories (An Institutional Award).
10. The Engineers of Grumman Aerospace Corporation (An Institutional Award).

The members of Congress scheduled to receive special service awards include: Representative Don Fuqua, Chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee, Representative Larry Winn, Ranking Minority Member of the House Science and Technology Committee, and Senator Paul Tsongas.

Honorary co-chairmen of the awards banquet are Senator Bob Packwood, Representative Norman Y. Mineta, and Representative Mervyn M. Dymally.●

NEWARK PLANS GALA COLUMBUS DAY PARADE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I look forward with great anticipation to the honor of participating once again in the annual Columbus Day Parade at noon on Sunday, October 7, in Newark.

The parade takes on a special meaning this year as the Nation embarks on planning to celebrate in 1992 the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee. The landing of Columbus on the island of San Salvador nearly 500 years ago was a remarkable feat, one that was destined to change the course of world history. We, the American

people, are the prime beneficiaries of Columbus' vision and courage, so it is fitting that we have a truly national observance that will be carried out with dignity and distinction.

All of our people, not just Italian-Americans, will be honoring Columbus for his discovery of this blessed land. I like to think that the great story of Columbus and his discovery is part of a continuing story, of which an important chapter was written recently when we saw the first woman and the first Italo-American honored as the Vice Presidential candidate of one of our major political parties. The discovery of Geraldine Ferraro is, in a larger sense, the rediscovery of America's meaning—and the fulfillment of its promise—that the American dream can indeed be realized by any man or woman no matter where he or she comes from. That is America's real greatness—and that is what we celebrate on Columbus Day.

The Newark parade will be an outstanding and a memorable affair, thanks in large measure to the dedicated efforts of Ace Alagna, executive director of the observance and publisher of the Italian Tribune, sponsor of the festivities.

The grand marshal will be the popular singer and actor, Frankie Avalon. Leading the parade will be the U.S. Military Academy Marching Band, followed by the West Point Cadets Color Corps. The Knights of Columbus Color Guards, in full dress, will also be at the head of the line of march. They will be followed by marching bands and drill units from dozens of schools and other organizations, colorful floats, and contingents from police and fire departments in the area. Gov. Thomas Kean and other State, county, and city officials will be in the parade and on the reviewing stand.

The festivities will culminate that evening with the traditional annual awards dinner at Biase's Restaurant in Newark, the official Columbus Day headquarters.

The Newark festivities further attest to the fact that Columbus Day is indeed a national holiday, one in which Americans of all ethnic heritages join in celebration all across our land. This broad participation on this day exemplifies the working partnership nurtured among the diverse cultures of America, a diversity that has contributed to our greatness and is a continuing source of our strength.

America has fulfilled the dreams of countless millions who have come to our shores in quest of a land where all people, regardless of origin, can reach their full potential. And I am proud that this fulfillment can be traced to Christopher Columbus, who is rightly called, "The Father of Immigration."

So it is with pride and pleasure that I will join in the Newark celebration.●

## JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF REFORM MEASURES IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1985 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, over 20 studies in the past 40 years, from the McNarney plan of 1944 to the one of former Joint Chiefs of Staff [JCS] Chairman David Jones in 1982, have looked at the issue of improving the workings of the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Criticisms of the organization have centered on: First, the competence of the Joint Chiefs themselves, second, the competence of the Joint Staff, those staff officers from the four services who assist the Joint Chiefs, and third, the problem of interservice rivalry in the "tank."

Over the past 3 years, the House of Representatives has dealt with this important issue in a thoughtful and responsible manner. In 1982, the Investigations Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee conducted 15 days of hearings. The bill it produced, H.R. 6954, was passed with broad bipartisan support in the House. The Senate did not have a chance to deal with the matter that year, and as a result, it died.

The House took up the matter once again in 1983 and, at my urging, held 3 further days of hearings on the issue. In close collaboration with former JCS Chairman Maxwell Taylor, I introduced a bill to reform the workings of the JCS, H.R. 2560. A number of the bill's provisions were incorporated in the Armed Services Committee bill, H.R. 3718, that passed with broad bipartisan support in the House.

This is the first time since 1958 that the Congress has addressed the issue of the workings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Twenty-six years ago, the law was changed to allow the chiefs of military services to delegate duties to the vice chiefs. This time around, the changes will be more substantial.

First, the Chairman of the JCS will be allowed to set the agenda. The Investigation Subcommittee found that members of the JCS in the past employed delaying tactics to prevent an issue from being resolved if they felt the resolution would not serve the parochial interests of their service. This reform would prevent that.

Second, the Chairman will be empowered to act as the spokesman of the nine specified and unified commanders—CINCEUR, CINCPAC, CINCLANT, and so forth. Too often in the past, the needs and concerns of combatant commands were neglected in Washington. This provision will help correct that problem.

Third, the Chairman will be able to select those officers to be assigned to the Joint Staff. Previously, some of the services have preferred to keep their best officers available for duty on the service staff rather than on the Joint Staff.

Yet this year's accomplishments are only the beginning. The House Armed Services Committee will come back to this matter again next year. There are strong indications already that the Senate will also give much keener attention to this vital matter. It is not a glamorous issue, but over the past few years, it has caught the attention of serious thinkers concerned about the workings of our defense establishment.●

## TRIBUTE TO E. BROOKE LEE

### HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to two tributes to the late E. Brooke Lee of Montgomery County, MD, one from the Washington Post and one from the Montgomery Journal. Colonel Lee, as he was known because of his military accomplishments, was the patriarch of a powerful Maryland political family and a pivotal force in shaping the community of Montgomery County as we know it today. Montgomery County's schools, roads, parks, and many other characteristics, as well as its reputation for strong, effective government, all bear the mark of the foresight and determination displayed by Colonel Lee many decades ago.

The articles, which delineate the remarkable legacy of E. Brooke Lee, follow:

#### COL. E. BROOKE LEE

In 1892, when Col. E. Brooke Lee was born, Montgomery County was farm land and something of a backwater. Unlike its better-located neighbor, Prince George's, it lacked the access to ports and the rail connections required for large-scale commercial farming, let alone industry. Montgomery seemed a poor prospect for development.

When he returned from the First World War, Col. Lee looked over Montgomery—Silver Spring was originally the name of a farm his family owned there—and he saw a different future. Among other things, he foresaw the meaning of the automobile. Suburban housing construction was getting slowly under way, but Col. Lee's purposes went well beyond dealing in land—although he did that very successfully. Over the vociferous objections of many voters, he began organizing the foundation for a local government sufficiently strong and competent to guide the kind of development that he had in mind.

He pushed bond issues, first to build a courthouse and then to build schools. Farmers charged that he was driving up their

taxes, and they derided the bonds as "Brooke Lee's mortgages." But the character of the schools began to change from a rural system with a bare-boned budget to one that could reliably prepare the children of suburban families for college. Col. Lee was instrumental in establishing a county police force. He was the leader in founding the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which became a national model in the use of land planning and zoning laws to guide development.

The irony of his career was that, after World War II, his friends and his adversaries changed places. The farmers and the land owners, seeing the rise in the value of their land, supported him. But the great wave of post-war development had brought into the county newcomers who considered developers in general and Col. Lee in particular to be their enemy. It is axiomatic in suburban politics that the people who moved into the last big subdivision are the most determined opponents of the next one. By the end of the 1950s he had been pushed out of active political life by the suburban voters whom he had labored to bring into the county.

But Col. Lee was the central figure in Montgomery's transformation from rural countryside to a densely populated suburb with an admirably strong tradition of good government and fine schools. Recent arrivals to the county sometimes assume that those public virtues came with the post-war subdivisions. In fact, they were established a generation earlier by a strong-willed politician who died last Friday, at the age of 91, at his home in Damascus.

#### E. BROOKE LEE'S LEGACY REACHES DEEP IN COUNTY

(By Michael Blankenheim)

Anyone who drives down a county road, goes to a county park or school, calls on the police or buys some beer at a county liquor store is touched by the legacy of E. Brooke Lee Sr., who died Friday.

Lee, the man who helped shape Montgomery County, died at 91 of pneumonia at his home in Damascus.

A former speaker of the Maryland House of Delegates and state comptroller, Mr. Lee's impact on Montgomery County and Maryland probably will be felt well into the next century.

During the past 60 years, Mr. Lee was either responsible for or had a hand in determining how the county's schools, Police Department, roads, parks, sewers, planning, real estate development and liquor sales would run.

Mr. Lee was a successful businessman, soldier, politician, real estate developer, farmer and patriarch of a powerful political family. "He would not do something unless he could be number one; that was his style," said Blair Lee IV, Mr. Lee's grandson.

"He was a pivotal figure in our history. His accomplishments were just incredible," said County Executive Charles W. Gilchrist.

Mr. Lee continued a family tradition of public service that goes back to before the Revolutionary War. His great-grandfather, Richard Henry Lee, signed the Declaration of Independence.

His great uncle was postmaster general for Abraham Lincoln; his father, Blair Lee, was a U.S. senator from Maryland. The family is also related to Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee.

And the current generations have carried on the family's tradition of accomplishment.

His son, Blair Lee III, was governor of Maryland, while Blair Lee IV, a former county lobbyist, is now running the gubernatorial campaign of Maryland Attorney General Stephen Sachs. Brooke Lee III has taken the reins of the family's real estate business, which Mr. Lee started in the 1920s and is now valued at about \$25 million.

"I knew the Colonel (Mr. Lee) for over 30 years, and I want to tell you that he was a visionary who was 50 years ahead of his time," said long-time family friend Buck Gladhill of Damascus.

"The Colonel would see things long before anyone else would, and years later they would happen. It will be a long time before we get another like him," Gladhill said.

Gladhill called Mr. Lee "Colonel" because of Mr. Lee's accomplishments in the military.

In 1912, he fought with the U.S. Army in Mexico during the days of Pancho Villa. During World War I, Mr. Lee was decorated for heroism and bravery by both the United States and France. He remained active in the national and state guards, rising to the rank of colonel.

He was born Oct. 23, 1892, at Blair House, across the street from the White House.

Mr. Lee was a student at Princeton University and received his law degree from Georgetown University before going off to fight in World War I.

After the war, he was elected state comptroller from 1920-1922. The next two years he was Maryland's secretary of state; from 1926-1930 he was speaker of the Maryland House of Delegates.

He also served as state chairman of the Maryland Democratic Party and was on the National Democratic Party's Platform Committee in 1924 and 1932.

He fell from political power during the late 1950s, and in the later years of his life he became one of the world's largest breeders of polled Hereford beef cattle on his Damascus farm.

Mr. Lee is survived by his wife, Nina G.; three sons, former Gov. Blair Lee III, E. Brooke Lee Jr. and Bruce Lee; 18 grandchildren; and 17 great-grandchildren.

A private burial will take place this Saturday. A public memorial service will be held Oct. 3 at the Grace Episcopal Church in Silver Spring on Georgia Avenue.

The family suggests that memorial contributions be made to the Grace Episcopal Church.

Blair Lee IV says that his grandfather's death, a month before Mr. Lee's 92nd birthday, came as no surprise to the family.

But even as his grandfather lay bedridden during the last two years of his life, Mr. Lee still exerted a larger-than-influence over the family he ruled for so long, said Blair Lee IV.

"In that sense, there is a very large vacuum now. He will be sorely missed," said Blair Lee IV. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO MART NIKLUS ON HIS 50TH BIRTHDAY

#### HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to be able to join the friends of Mart Niklus in honoring him on the occasion of his 50th birth-

day, for he is truly one of the giant figures of our time. For all of his adult life, Mart Niklus has been leading the struggle for the rights of Estonia to exist as an independent country, for her people to be free, for her rich culture to enjoy a natural, unfettered development. Estonia, like so many other countries dominated by the Soviet Union, has been waging a struggle against Russification, against national extinction. Through the courageous work of Mart Niklus and other members of the human and national rights movement in Estonia and other countries dominated by Moscow, that threat is being successfully resisted.

The cost for brave people like Mart Niklus has been severe. Most of his adult life has been spent in prisons, labor camps, and under constant KGB surveillance and supervision. His resolve and courage, however, remain unshaken. His example and his leadership are contributing to Estonia's continued viability as a nation and to the continued aspirations of her sons and daughters for freedom and independence.

By speaking for the rights of Estonia, Mart Niklus is standing in the forefront of the struggle for universal principles of human rights. This means that ultimately, he speaks for all of us. If the rights of Estonians are denied, that diminishes all of us. If, on the other hand, we join Mart Niklus in his cause, we stand with him in behalf of all humanity struggling for its rights. I have been proud to be associated with Mart Niklus' struggle and join his many friends and admirers in wishing him a happy birthday and in rededicating myself to the principles that give him strength and the rest of us renewed dedication. ●

#### AN AMERICAN GOLD COINAGE

#### HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am offering this bill today because at the end of 1984 the only ongoing gold coinage program at the U.S. Mint is scheduled to expire. What that will mean is a surge of new business for the gold coins of South Africa, Red China, Swiss banks and other foreign nations because the U.S. Mint will drop out of production.

We don't think this should be allowed to happen. This bill will extend the U.S. gold coinage program established in 1979 by Public Law 95-630 beyond its scheduled December 31 expiration date. It will also make several statutory improvements to give the Mint a "superior product" that can immediately take a giant share of the gold coin market away from South

Africa and the other foreign governments that sell so many gold coins in the United States today.

This bill is supported by the Treasury and the Mint. The Commission on the Role of Gold, chaired by Secretary Donald T. Regan, in its report to Congress on March 31, 1982, recommended a U.S. gold coinage of this type to compete with the foreign coins that sell about 3 million ounces in the United States each year. The Senate Banking Committee has held hearings on April 15, 1983, and the House of Representatives held hearings on substantially the same proposal in the 97th Congress—with all witnesses in favor of this legislation. Both times, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Affairs Manuel Johnson testified in favor of the coinage legislation.

This bill will bring several benefits to the Treasury and the U.S. economy: it will improve America's balance of trade, promote competition in the coin markets around the world, restore at least symbolically the U.S. coinage that was discontinued 50 years ago, reduce about \$10 million in new revenue to help reduce the budget deficit and strike an important blow against the repugnant practice of apartheid. This is a bipartisan measure, a measure with widespread support among both liberal and conservative Members of both Houses of Congress, a measure with administration support, and we believe it is a proposal with almost universal support among the American people.

The South African krugerrand coins have been sold in the United States for 10 years, and they are advertised as "world money"—in competition with the U.S. dollar, which really is the world's money. Since 1986 is the centennial of the Statue of Liberty, and since liberty is the one thing the black gold miners of South Africa don't enjoy, this new legal-tender U.S. gold bullion coin will be emblazoned with the most famous American symbols of liberty. And you can bet they will be a popular coin even in the Republic of South Africa.

This bill is not a "gold stand" bill—so all the technical, economic, and legal objections against returning to the gold standard need not be debated here now. We do know that millions of Americans want to own and use gold coins as a hedge against inflation, or as a form of enduring savings to pass on to their grandchildren.

Now that we are finally up against the deadline for extending the gold coin program of the Mint, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this bill now to keep the United States in the competition.●

SOVIET JEWISH REFUSENIK,  
ALEKSANDER IOFFEE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, during these Jewish holidays I think it's important to remember the difficult situation facing Jews in the Soviet Union. I'd like to call special attention to the plight of Aleksander Ioffee, 1 of the 3 million Jews in the U.S.S.R. The conditions these people face compel me to participate in the 1984 Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jews.

Aleksander Ioffee is a refusenik, which means he's a Soviet Jew prohibited from emigrating to Israel and persecuted by the KGB. Like other refuseniks, he's not allowed to have a job bearing any responsibility. This is despite the fact that he's a prominent scholar in his country.

Ioffee's received degrees from the Mathematics Department of Moscow University and the Central Institute of Aero- and Hydrodynamics. He was appointed to a professorship at the Moscow Institute of Automobile and Road Building in 1971. At the same time, he became a member of the Moscow Mathematical Society and a member of the editorial board of the Society for Industry and Mathematics [SIAM], of Philadelphia.

In 1976, Ioffee applied to emigrate to Israel. He was immediately demoted from his professorship, becoming a researcher at the same institute. Furthermore, he's been offered a number of temporary teaching posts at universities in Europe and the United States (including one in Georgia), but the Soviets have declared he's irreplaceable and necessary to the teaching process. The Soviet Union won't allow him to accept any post outside of his country.

The Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs initially told Ioffee that his emigration case wouldn't be considered until 1982. But in 1978, he said that the refusal period for Ioffee could last indefinitely. Also, since applying to emigrate, Ioffee's mail has been tampered with and his telephone was disconnected for a full year.

Ioffee used to attend scientific seminars sponsored by the prominent Soviet Jew Viktor Brailovsky. After Brailovsky's arrest and imprisonment in 1980, Ioffee hosted these seminars. He's since been consistently harassed by the KGB, his apartment door has been set on fire, and the seminars have been outlawed.

Aleksander Ioffee is 1 of more than 300,000 Soviet Jews who've said they'd like to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. and who've been denied this right. Since 1979, Jewish emigration has declined 98 percent. At the same time, officially

sanctioned anti-Semitic campaigns and restrictions against refuseniks have increased dramatically.

We Americans must continue to decry the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union. The dilemma of Aleksander Ioffee and Soviet Jewry is an issue we need to recognize and respond to, now during Rosh Hashanah and during the rest of the year.●

NEWARK PLANS GALA  
COLUMBUS DAY PARADE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I look forward with great anticipation to the honor of participating once again in the annual Columbus Day Parade at noon on Sunday, October 7, in Newark.

The parade takes on a special meaning this year as the Nation embarks on planning to celebrate in 1992 the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee. The landing of Columbus on the island of San Salvador nearly 500 years ago was a remarkable feat, one that was destined to change the course of world history. We, the American people, are the prime beneficiaries of Columbus' vision and courage, so it is fitting that we have a truly national observance that will be carried out with dignity and distinction.

The Newark parade will be an outstanding and a memorable affair, thanks in large measure to the dedicated efforts of Ace Alagna, executive director of the observance and publisher of the Italian Tribune, sponsor of the festivities.

The grand marshal will be the popular singer and actor, Frankie Avalon. Leading the parade will be the U.S. Military Academy Marching Band, followed by the West Point Cadets Color Corps. The Knights of Columbus Color Guards, in full dress, will also be at the head of the line of march. They will be followed by marching bands and drill units from dozens of schools and other organizations, colorful floats and contingents from police and fire departments in the area. Gov. Thomas Kean and other State, county, and city officials will be in the parade and on the reviewing stand.

The festivities will culminate that evening with the traditional annual awards dinner at Biase's Restaurant in Newark, the official Columbus Day headquarters.

The Newark festivities further attest to the fact that Columbus Day is indeed a national holiday, one in which Americans of all ethnic heritages join in celebration all across our land. This broad participation on this day exemplifies the working partner-

ship nurtured among the diverse cultures of America, a diversity that has contributed to our greatness and is a continuing source of our strength.

America has fulfilled the dreams of countless millions who have come to our shores in quest of a land where all people, regardless of origin, can reach their full potential. And I am proud that this fulfillment can be traced to Christopher Columbus, who is rightly called, "The Father of Immigration."

So it is with pride and pleasure that I will join in the Newark celebration.●

H.R. 4684 NUTRITION  
MONITORING

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform our colleagues about the status of and need for H.R. 4684, the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1984. The Science and Technology Committee favorably reported the bill on September 20. The committee's report, House Report 98-1076, clearly documents the need for a legislative mandate to ensure that a comprehensive, national nutrition monitoring system be in place. The report also provides a history of nutrition monitoring in the United States which illustrates that the responses of this administration, as well as previous administrations, have not been adequate to fulfill the needs of the users of nutrition monitoring products and services. In fact, the limited resources available for nutrition monitoring are not being effectively used due to the lack of a central focus for Federal activities and a comprehensive plan to guide those activities.

During joint hearings on H.R. 4684 before the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, which I chair, and the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research, and Foreign Agriculture, chaired by our colleague GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., non-Federal witnesses assessed the adequacy of the Federal nutrition monitoring activities since the 1981 implementation plan was submitted to the Congress. We received testimony from over 50 organizations ranging from scientific societies, State and local governments, health, and service organizations, consumer, antihunger, senior, and religious groups, and food producers and processors. I would like to share the following excerpts from the testimony of various witnesses:

"The original plans for a comprehensive nutrition monitoring system were first proposed in 1978 and developed in more detail in 1981 by USDA and DHHS. In spite of the more than

6 years since the inception of the idea, there is little progress in evidence and, in fact, plans for the first steps in integration of HANES (Health and Nutrition Examination Survey) and NFCS (National Food Consumption Survey) have been delayed."

"Presently the data obtained from these various sources are not integrated to provide the timely and comprehensive view of food practices, trends and health implications that could be constructed from the comprehensive data collected by the surveys cited. This should be a major function of a national nutrition monitoring system. In most instances, agencies have not had sufficient resources to insure timely analysis and release of national survey data. These resources should also be provided so that the research and academic community in the United States could play its complementary role in analysis and interpretation of national survey results."

"There is little practically-oriented epidemiologic research to develop shorter and cheaper methods of monitoring nutritional status, food consumption, nutrition knowledge, and food scarcity suitable for use by States, localities, and others needing such methods."

I would also like to congratulate Senator JEFF BINGAMAN for introducing, on September 25, a Senate companion measure to H.R. 4684, S. 3022. Senator BINGAMAN has identified numerous reasons which demonstrate the need for a legislative mandate. I would especially like to emphasize his view that nutrition monitoring is fundamental to effective health promotion and that, "If the Federal Government assumed an aggressive role in health promotion and disease prevention, millions of taxpayer dollars now spent for medical services would be saved". I would also like to underscore the importance of providing State and local governments technical assistance in developing the capacity to conduct nutrition monitoring and obtaining access to nutritional status data which they urgently need.

On September 24, Senator DOLE introduced S. 3017, a bill to improve and extend certain domestic food assistance programs. I was pleased to see that title II of the bill focused on nutritional status monitoring and surveillance. Although title II of the Dole bill is less comprehensive than H.R. 4684 and S. 3022, the nutrition monitoring objectives are compatible and consistent with H.R. 4684 and S. 3022 which are identical.

I encourage our colleagues to become familiar with our constituents' nutrition monitoring needs and support H.R. 4684 which Mr. MACKAY, Mr. BROWN of California, and I introduced in response to the users who rely on a national nutrition monitoring system.●

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF  
DRAMATIC ARTS CENTENNIAL

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to bring to my colleagues' attention an historic cultural event taking place in my district on October 3, 1984. This date marks the centennial of the American Academy of Dramatic Arts, the oldest acting school in the United States and Great Britain. I would like to submit for the RECORD my remarks to the academy in honor of this momentous occasion.

REMARKS OF HON. BILL GREEN TO THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF DRAMATIC ARTS, IN HONOR OF ITS CENTENNIAL, OCTOBER 3, 1984

I take great pride in having this opportunity to join with Mayor Koch and members of the arts community in this tribute to the American Academy of Dramatic Arts.

When Franklin Sargent and James Steele MacKay founded the Academy one hundred years ago today, they formed one of the world's finest schools for the dramatic arts. Little did they know at that time that the Academy would continue to thrive one hundred years later, still drawing students from around the world for training in drama, voice, dance and other theatrical skills. Today the Academy can boast alumni who include Cecil B. DeMille, Edward G. Robinson, Spencer Tracy, Grace Kelly, Rosalind Russell, Jason Robards, Ann Bancroft and Robert Redford.

When most of us attend the theatre, we watch a performance and accept a fine actor's portrayal of his character. Seldom do we stop to think about the skills required to make that character believable. It is the quality of education and training provided by the Academy that make such outstanding performances possible.

New York City is recognized around the globe as the world's greatest cultural center. Millions of visitors come to the "Big Apple" specifically for the arts. Only London or ancient Athens can rival New York City as the home of the theatre.

The American Academy of Dramatic Arts has played an integral part in our city's cultural achievement. I commend George Cuttingham, President of the Academy, as well as the faculty and students here, for their continuing dedication to the dramatic arts. Let me extend particular appreciation to the members of the Academy for their significant contributions to the theatrical community in New York City. I congratulate you on your centennial, and wish you continued success in the next hundred years and beyond.●

FREEDOM FRIDAY

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the cost of alcohol and drug abuse to our country is a national catastrophe. The

Office of Technology Assessment estimated that the cost from alcohol abuse alone in 1983 was near \$120 billion. The Drug Enforcement Administration—DEA—estimates that the 1983 marijuana production is valued at some \$13.9 billion. The Research Triangle Institute estimates that the cost of drug abuse in this country was an incredible \$59.7 billion. Half of that figure alone is attributed to lost production due to worker absenteeism.

The most tragic consequence of alcohol and drug abuse is the human toll; the nearly 150,000 people who die directly or indirectly from alcohol abuse, the countless broken homes, bankruptcies, and other unnecessary disruptions of people's personal and professional lives. Alcohol and drugs are involved in over 60 percent of all homicides committed in this country every year. It is estimated that at least 100 million Americans are directly affected by drug abuse. This problem does not recognize boundaries of age, color, gender, or profession.

Fortunately, today there are many good community resources and programs which help in the prevention, identification, treatment, and recovery of chemical and drug abusers and their families. One of these new programs is Freedom Friday, advocated and sponsored by Ramsey Action Programs of St. Paul, MN. Freedom Friday is a day dedicated to the celebration of being free from dependence upon alcohol and other mood altering drugs. Freedom Friday issues a challenge to all Americans to abstain from using alcohol or other nonprescribed mood-altering drugs on Friday, March 8, 1985. Additionally, people are asked to sign a pledge statement to avoid driving while under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

By doing so, we remind ourselves again that the emphasis on the prevention of alcohol and drug abuse prevents both a human and financial catastrophe. Similarly, Freedom Friday celebrates the success that many in our society have had in coping with alcohol and drug abuse. The long lonely path that they have traveled to overcome alcohol and drug abuse deserves recognition and praise.

I commend Freedom Friday, and Mr. Mike Port, a driving force behind this initiative, and indeed all of those associated with the Ramsey Action Program for their important work in this area of community service.●

#### TRIBUTE TO RAY WEIGEL

### HON. DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment about a remarka-

ble gentleman from my district who, through his years of unselfish deeds for the good people of Cadillac and northern Michigan, has brought the meaning of the word "greatness" into sharp focus.

The man I'm referring to is Ray Weigel, president and chief executive officer of Kysor Industries Corp., a position he cherishes, a position from which he has turned countless visions into bold realities. Ray is flag waver, one of northern Michigan's most ardent boosters. His belief in people and what they can accomplish through persistence is legendary.

To say that Ray has community spirit is an understatement. Since way back in 1946, when he first planted roots in Cadillac, he has devoted his energies to organizing the major financial institution in the area. He has served on an impressive list of State and Federal panels, donated his time as "Industrial Ambassador" to the Seattle World's Fair of 1962 and the International Trade Advisory Council. He has taken young entrepreneurs and taught them to reach for the stars. And they have.

Given his drive and his unswerving faith in people, how can a man like Ray Weigel best be honored? One way is through a testimonial dinner on October 5 in Cadillac which I will attend. Many of Ray's friends from all over Michigan will be on hand to say "thanks" for a job well done. Ray Weigel is a special person, a breed apart. Our State has been enriched by his presence.●

#### H.R. 3601, PIKE NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY BILL

### HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3601, the Pike National Forest boundary bill which was passed by the House on September 24, 1984.

Specifically, I rise in support of a provision offered by my colleague Representative CLARKE during markup of this bill in the Interior Committee, which would designate the segment of the Horsepasture River between Bahayee Road and Lake Jocassee in Transylvania County, NC, to be studied for potential designation as a wild and scenic river.

This portion of the Horsepasture River has been a favorite spot for trout fishermen, hikers, and waterfall lovers in upstate South Carolina and western North Carolina for many years. The Horsepasture River drops 1,700 feet in 4 miles off the Blue Ridge escarpment in western North Carolina above the South Carolina-North Caro-

lina border. In this drop there are five spectacular waterfalls.

It is important that the Horsepasture River be studied for designation as a wild and scenic river because of its potential destruction by a small hydroelectric power project. The proposed project would divert a significant portion of the river's flow through a pipeline. This diversion would bypass the falls area along the river and would ultimately channel the river's flow through a hydroelectric facility at the base of the falls area. Flow within the Horsepasture River, from the headgate to the tailrace of this project, would be reduced from a majestic river, comprised of five spectacular falls areas, to a dry river bed with only a trickle of water flowing over the falls areas.

Mr. Speaker, a tremendous number of residents of my district as well residents of Congressman CLARKE's district have contacted me and expressed their concern about the possible loss of this most scenic river. Therefore, I believe that the study included in this bill is most appropriate, and wish to join with and congratulate my border State colleague for his successful efforts on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I strongly support H.R. 3601. I urge our colleagues in the Senate to take expeditious action on this measure.●

#### EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

### HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an amendment to H.R. 4444, the bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act. The bill, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, would double the appropriations ceiling for the small projects loan program, from \$600 million, to \$1.2 billion. This amount of additional authority is intended to allow new loans to be made without further Congressional authorization for the next 5 years.

If we in this body are serious about reducing our chronic Federal deficit, then I believe that new domestic spending commitments such as this must be examined with the utmost care. I am concerned that an authorization increase of this size would be extended for the reclamation loan program without considering reforms that might be useful in reducing costs to the Treasury. Perhaps the purposes of this program can be advanced in a less costly way. Perhaps the basic premises of a no-interest loan program for irrigated farms in the Western States warrant reevaluation. In either event, I believe that the prudent course for

us to take at this late date in the 98th Congress would be an authorization increase limited to 1-year's worth of new loan expenditures. Let us not commit an extra half billion dollars to this program without the opportunity for further oversight. ●

THE 75TH BIRTHDAY FOR  
H. ALLEN SMITH

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, a distinguished and esteemed former Member of the House will have his 75th birthday. I am speaking of my predecessor H. Allen Smith of Glendale, CA.

For 16 years, Al Smith served with distinction, efficiency, and productivity. He is remembered with respect and admiration. He worked hard. He was just and evenhanded.

H. Allen Smith was born in 1909 in Dixon, IL, where he had a playmate named Ronald Reagan. At the age of 15, he moved with his family to Los Angeles, CA. He was educated at Hollywood High School, UCLA and USC where he earned a law degree. Shortly thereafter, he joined the FBI and served ably for 7 years.

In 1943, he began his political career as a member of the California State Assembly. After 8 years, he ran for the House upon the death of Carl Henshaw. He served from the 86th through the 92d Congress. During his tenure, he became the ranking Republican on the Rules Committee where he enjoyed great success playing a key role in House legislative matters and as the Republican Party's foremost authority on rules and procedures.

Upon his retirement, former Congressman Hale Boggs said,

There have been occasions, of course, when he and I have been on different sides. This is as it should be in a two-party system. But I have never known a time when he has deliberately obstructed the consideration of legislation, regardless of how he may have felt about it personally. Nor have I ever known a time when he has not shown total and complete respect for this institution and the rules under which we are governed.

Mr. Speaker, during his eight terms as a Member of Congress, H. Allen Smith brought only honor and respect to the House and himself. He was a man of high principle with an unyield-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing commitment to duty. He served with courage and fairness.

I'm delighted to remember him to all his friends in the House on his 75th birthday. I wish him and his lovely wife, Elizabeth, who also has a birthday in early October, what they gave to this institution for 16 years and that is the very best. ●

NORTH AND SOUTH WILL UNITE

HON. BUDDY MacKAY

OF FLORIDA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. MacKAY. Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that people of differing backgrounds, party affiliations, and political ideologies come together.

Today I would like to share with you my excitement and enthusiasm about the engagement of Miss Ameer Fouche to Mr. Andrew Vermilye. Ameer, an attractive Republican southerner from Mississippi, has agreed to wed Andy, a handsome northern Democrat.

We are always searching for the woman/man of our dreams—and it seems Andy and Ameer agree that their dreams have been answered. They wish to spend the rest of their lives with one another.

Each person who has had the pleasure of seeing Andy and Ameer together truly can notice how deeply they share their love for one another.

I truly am honored today to congratulate them both and wish them many joyous years filled with health and happiness.

Andy and Ameer, the best to you both. ●

RULE ON TRADE LEGISLATION

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform my colleagues that the Committee on Ways and Means yesterday favorably reported to the House of Representatives the following bills:

H.R. 6301, to provide authority for enforcing arrangements restricting the importation of carbon and alloy steel products into the United States that are entered into for purposes of implementing the President's national

September 28, 1984

policy for the steel industry, and for other purposes, as amended;

H.R. 6023, to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to renew the authority for the operation of the generalized system of preferences, and for other purposes, as amended;

H.R. 3795, to harmonize, reduce and eliminate barriers to trade in wine on a basis which assures substantially equivalent competitive opportunities for all wine moving in international trade, as amended; and

H.R. 5377, authorizing the President to enter into, and to proclaim modifications necessary to implement, a trade agreement with Israel providing for duty-free treatment for, and the elimination of import restrictions on, the products of Israel, as amended.

I wish to serve notice, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic caucus, that I have been instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to seek less than an open rule for the consideration of the provisions of this bill within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means by the House of Representatives. ●

H.R. 5290, COMPASSIONATE PAIN  
RELIEF ACT

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 28, 1984

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that my vote, on September 19, in favor of H.R. 5290, the Compassionate Pain Relief Act, was miscast. I mistakenly voted for this bill although I was strongly set against it. While I believe that we must commit ourselves to finding therapies to alleviate the pain experienced by terminal cancer patients, this legislation is clearly not the solution. With the availability of Dilaudid-HP, a new analgesic which is both more potent and more soluble than heroin, the case to approve heroin seems less compelling. There is no question that the legalization of heroin, would pose significant safety, enforcement, and security problems.

Prior to this vote, I had communicated with the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and voiced my strong objections to the legalization of heroin, and assured her of my active role in defeating this bill. ●